

Prolegomena to a Study of the Iranian Aspects in Arsacid Armenia, by Nina G. Garsoian, from the journal *Hande's Amso'reay* 90 (1976), columns 177-234, in 29 pdf pages.

Nina G. GARSOIAN

PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF
THE IRANIAN ASPECTS IN ARSACID ARMENIA *

In his outraged condemnation of the "ignobile decretum" by which Jovian in 364 abandoned Armenia to the Persian King of Kings, Šāhpuhr II, Ammianus Marcellinus referred to the Armenian Arsacid King, Aršak II, as "*amico nobis semper et fido...*"¹. Yet, at several points in his *Annals*, Ammianus' direct and explicit predecessor, Tacitus, had passed a considerably sourer judgment on Armenia: "*Ambigua gens ea antiquitus hominum ingeniis et situ terrarum...*" and gone on to comment "... *maximisque imperiis interiecti et saepius discordes sunt, adversus Romanos odio et in Parthum invidia*"².

A similarly ambiguous relationship vis-à-vis Persia emerges from a curious passage in the fifth century *History of Armenia* by P'awstos Buzand in which the Armenian King alternately fawns upon and threatens the Sasanian ruler Šāhpuhr II³ and, indeed, from a close reading of what purports to be the earliest of the Armenian sources:

* Most of the research on which this paper is based was done on an ACLS/Academy of Sciences of the USSR Exchange with a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to all of whom it gives me great pleasure to express my sincere appreciation for their help. Two preliminary versions of the paper were presented at the annual meetings of the Middle East Studies Association in Boston, November, 1974 and The Association of Ancient Historians at Columbus, Ohio, May, 1975. As indicated by its title, this is a mere introduction to the subject which I intend to treat more fully at a future date. No attempt has been made at this point to present a complete bibliography on any subject; this too must await a later stage of the present research. Finally, exigencies of space have unfortunately precluded the citation of most of the sources.

"The days of the Parthian Kingdom came to an end with the seizure of the sovereignty from Artewan, son of Valarš, at his murder by Artasir, son of Sasan, who was a magnate from the district of Stahr, ... although the sad news of his death soon reached Xosrov, King of Armenia — who was second in the realm of the Persians, for whoever was King of Armenia had second rank in the Persian realm — he had no time to complete preparations for war. Then, he turned back greatly saddened by what had taken place, for he had been unable to accomplish anything; and in deep sorrow at the outcome of the events he returned to his own land.

But at the beginning of the following year, Xosrov, King of Armenia, began to raise troops and gather an army... in order to invade the Persian territory, to overrun [it] from Asorestan [Mesopotamia] to be gates of Tisbon [Ctesiphon]. He laid waste the entire country... He left all the inhabited land devastated and ruined. He sought to eradicate, to destroy, totally to extirpate, to overthrow to its very foundations... the Persian realm. At the same time he swore an oath to seek vengeance with deepest hatred for their [his kinsmen's] loss of the sovereignty; urged on by [his] great hatred, he sought to exact total vengeance... [to] seek vengeance for the blood of Artewan"⁴.

This famous passage which opens the so-called *History of "Agat'angelos"* has long been familiar to students of Armenian history. But the full significance of the antithesis between its explicit hatred of Persia and its implicit acceptance of the Iranian tribal social pattern inherent in the Armenian King's automatic assumption of the blood feud for his murdered kinsmen has not always been perceived⁵. There is, to be sure, no

question that the Armenian Arsacids were a junior branch of the Parthian royal house, since Classical sources clearly spell out the relationship, which appears likewise, albeit in garbled form, in the native Armenian accounts recorded by Movsēs Xorenac'i⁶. Nor have scholars failed to note diverse, though scattered, links connecting Iran and Armenia during this period⁷. Nevertheless, the Armenian ecclesiastical historiographic tradition born in the fifth century A. D., at the very moment when a life and death struggle opposed Christian Armenia to Zoroastrian Persia, consciously or unconsciously, worked to obscure much of Armenia's Iranian past⁸.

It is not my intention to retrace here the history of the Arsacid house in Armenia, nor, in speaking of the Iranian aspects of the Arsacid dynasty, do I intend to deal with the repeated political interference of Parthian or Sasanian Iran in the internal affairs of Armenia as part of the constant rivalry opposing to each other the two contemporary world empires: Persia and Rome, nor indeed to claim that the Iranian aspect is the only one to deserve consideration; it is merely the one which has enjoyed the most consistent neglect from Armenologists⁹. The curious ambivalence of Christian Armenia separated from Sasanian Iran both by religion and by the tradition of Parthian blood feud manifests itself in occasion political vacillation as well as in the intellectual and artistic life of the country; in the duplicate educational institutions and bilingual liturgy (Greek and Syriac) which preceded the creation of the Armenian alphabet, in the early fifth century¹⁰; in the terracotta figurines of the Parthian rider which accompany traditional Hellenistic statuary in the excavations of Artaxata¹¹; in the classical training which allowed seventh century Armenian geographers to cite Pappus of Alexandria and Ptolemy¹² at the same time as Christian Armenian writers presented their native history in the terms of the Iranian Epic and distorted traditional hagiographic patterns to adapt them to the taste of an Iranized audience¹³. On balance, however, and without going into further details, the fabric of Armenian life, its social, legal and administrative institutions

as well as its tastes and mores, reveals a far greater coincidence with the Iranian tradition¹⁴. All that I shall attempt to do in this brief outline is to point out some of the Iranian components of Armenian culture in the Arsacid period and to note some of their implications for the political and social development of the country. As such, this paper will present simultaneously a short synthesis and a plan for further research. It is intended as a guidepost for the future and in no sense as an exhaustive study¹⁵.

Even before crossing the frontier into Armenia proper, we may find it enlightening to pause and observe the significant attitudes of its two great neighbours. For Rome, Armenia, thought often a client, remained essentially a foreign country; its control by Trajan, an act of conquest¹⁶. For Persia, on the contrary, Armenia, usually a component of Ērān¹⁷, formed part of the ancestral lands to be granted to sons and brothers by the Sasanians, as well as the Parthians¹⁸; to be protected against the injury of Caesar¹⁹; to be proselytized zealously²⁰, and to be conceded special honors²¹.

In the Armenians' own eyes, the bond between the royal houses of Parthia and Armenia was indissoluble. Inflexibly, and monotonously the native sources treat the terms "King" and "Arsacid" (Aršakuni) as inseparable and synonymous, to the very end of the dynasty²². They deny that even an Arsacid's sins might deprive him of the crown²³, or that anyone else, no matter how illustrious, could prove worthy to wear it²⁴. They urge the Armenians to die for their Arsacid lords²⁵, and observe approvingly that the obligation to undertake the blood-feud, assumed by King Xosrov at Artewan's death, was accepted from generation to generation²⁶. So strong was this identification of all the Armenians with the Arsacid crown, that, even after the partition of the country, the Sasanian ruler, Šāhpuhr III, would allow them a king from this house so as to win over their loyalty²⁷.

The Iranian blood lineage extended even beyond the royal house to the hereditary patriarchal family of St. Gregory, descended from the great Parthian family of the

Sūrēn²⁸, as the mighty Kamsarakan lords were from the Kāren²⁹. Even in the last days of the Armenian Kingdom, Movsēs Xorenac'i would claim, that St. Gregory's great, great grandson, the patriarch St. Sahak I had been honoured at the Persian court "first of all, because of his illustrious Pahlawik house... the Sūrēn", and only then, because of the respect due to God's servants³⁰. Thus, the two leading families of Armenia, the royal and ecclesiastical dynasties, and at least one and probably many³¹ of the powerful native clans proudly proclaimed not merely Iranian descent, but blood ties to the three greatest houses of Parthia: the royal Arsacids, in the senior line, the Sūrēn and the Kāren.

I noted a moment ago that linguists had led the way in our acknowledgment of Armenia's Iranian past. From the days of Hübschmann and Meillet to the recent studies of Benveniste, Bolognesi and Perikhanian, they have amply demonstrated that Early Mediaeval Armenian vocabulary is riddled with Iranian loan words, particularly in the crucial areas of personal and social relationships, government, religion, and law³². The same pattern is borne out by the toponymy of mediaeval Armenia, with its numerous localities incorporating the revealing religious prefix *Bag-* "god": Bagrewand, Bagaran, Bagawan, Bagayañč³³, and by its religious and secular onomasticon where even the family of the Christian martyrs par excellence — of the champions of the Armenian last stand at the battle of Avarayr — favours such unmistakably Iranian names as Vardan, Vahan, Vasak, Hamazasp and Hmayeak³⁴. Such a foreign candidate to the Armenian throne, as Zeno of Pontus, found it wise to exchange his Greek name to the Iranian Artaxias (Artašēs), more acceptable to the ears of his prospective subjects³⁵.

Moving inward from vocabulary to institutions, scholars long since observed that evidence for Magian beliefs and practices was to be found in the accounts of the journey of the Arsacid candidate, Trdat I (Tiridates) of Armenia, to Rome for his coronation by Nero³⁶. Vague as is our knowledge of Parthian Religion anywhere, the great Armenian pantheon dominated by Aramazd, Mihr,

Anahit, Vahagn and Tir could look only eastward towards Iran and further, for its homeland³⁷. Similarly, Armenian rituals noticeably resembled Iranian practices³⁸. Late attempts at reforms, such as the possible reduction of this pantheon to a dominant trinity: Aramazd, Anahit, Vahagn, perhaps reflected in King Trdat's edict immediately preceding the Christianization of Armenia³⁹, or the high priest, Kartir's, imposition of fire-temples at the end of the third century, and the regulations reinforcing fire worship attributed to King "Artašir" by Movsēs Xorenac'i⁴⁰, might have been thoroughly and even violently unwelcome; but they can hardly be interpreted as the de-Iranization of religious institutions, whose ancient roots were underlined by King Xosrov's sacrifices to the shrines of "his Arsacid family" upon return from his victorious avenging campaigns⁴¹.

Most importantly of all, the works of Adontz, Manandyan, Benveniste and a number of others have led us to see the inescapable parallels between the social structure and hierarchy of Armenia and Persia, so that Armenia has now become the *locus classicus* for the study of so-called "Iranian Feudalism"⁴². The division of Armenian society into classes of magnates, nobles, free knights (*azat*) and common people (both artisans and peasants), with a hereditary order of precedence or *gah* ("throne"), find their counterpart in the regulations attributed to Ardašir I or Xusrō I Ānōširwān in the *pahlavi* tradition of the *Letter of Tansar*, the *Testament of Ardašir*, the *Āyīn* ("Regulations") of Ardašir and the Arabic works derived from them⁴³. The entire list of the great Armenian hereditary offices: the royal coronant (*t'agadir* / *t'agakap*), the commander-in-chief of the army (*sparapet*) and of the cavalry (*aspet*), the "Second after the King", and many others, is a familiar one to students of Iranian society⁴⁴. The very concept of a hereditary office, totally irreconcilable with the Classical — Graeco-Roman — tradition of elected magistrates and appointed civil servants, was so pervasive in Armenia, that it applied not only to the ruler but even to the patriarchal dignity, in a manner wholly unacceptable to the canonic definition of a

bishop⁴⁵. The obligation of the king to act in consultation with the council of the nobles — who advised him, ratified his accession, were able to act in his absence, or even against him — is amply attested both in Armenia and in Iran⁴⁶.

The social and economic bases of this clan society, with its privileges and common unalienable property belonging to the "eternal family: past, present and future", a property of which the senior representative of the clan was but the temporary administrator and which the king could not confiscate as long as a single member of the agnatic group survived; all these characteristic aspects that emerge clearly from the early Armenian sources⁴⁷. Many of their Iranian prototypes can now be traced in the *Sasanian Lawbook*, the *Mātakdān ī hazār dātastān*⁴⁸, while the rapid de-Armenization following Justinian's forcible introduction of the Roman laws of inheritance in the districts under his control demonstrates the incompatibility of the tribal society still characteristic of sixth century Armenia with imperial institutions⁴⁹.

Parallels between Armenian and Iranian usages can be maintained even in the seeming trivia of daily practices. The ceremonial of the Armenian Arsacid court revolving around the royal hunt and the royal banquet is an unmistakable reflection of Iranian customs and tastes⁵⁰. One of the main foci in the training of a prince in the Iranian tradition was the mastering of superior horsemanship and spectacular cynegetic arts, as even foreign authors from Herodotus to Tacitus had not failed to observe⁵¹. The hunt with its companion piece, the banquet are probably the dominant themes of the *Šāhnāma*, as they are in the reliefs at Taq-ī Bostan and particularly in the magnificent Sasanian silver plates which have come down to us⁵². Similarly, the Armenian kings are depicted as living largely on horseback, creating great hunting preserves or "paradises", and feasting with their nobles⁵³. Hunting was a noble privilege in the Iranian world from which the base born were excluded, as the youthful Ardašīr learned to his humiliation⁵⁴. The surpassing of the king's prowess by a subject was viewed as an act of *lèse-majesté* as

much by Aršak II of Armenia as by Ardawān the Parthian⁵⁵. At a higher level still, the intrinsic nature — good or evil — of the protagonist is disclosed with particular clarity in exercises of horsemanship. This is the moment of truth in which the cowardly unworthiness of the Armenian non-Arsacid King, Šapuh and the deceit of Ardawan's son manifests themselves⁵⁶, while the royal lineage and qualities of Ardašīr and Hormizd are revealed in the *Kārnāmag*⁵⁷. Similarly, the banquet serves to display the social rank of the guest through the seat or *Gah* assigned to him. It is once again the setting for the humiliation of Aršak II and the insult to Rustam, denied their proper place⁵⁸, the additional demonstration of the Armenian Šapuh's unworthiness, and conversely the celebration of the royal glory depicted on another familiar series of Sasanian plates⁵⁹.

The careful selection by both P'awstos Buzand and Movsēs Xorenac'i of the precept of the fourth century Armenian patriarch, Nersēs I the Great that they cite: the injunction against consanguinous marriages, underscores the survival in Armenia of this Zoroastrian tradition perpetuated in the Iranian royal house, despite the outrage of both Classical and Christian morality by this practice⁶⁰. Armenian scholars long since realized that early native accounts contain a curious mixture of Classical and Biblical historiography with the Iranian Epic tradition, though this element still requires considerable further exploration⁶¹. Even various minutiae of regalia, insignia, and colour of dress indicating social rank find their counterparts at the Armenian and Iranian courts⁶². In summary, then, we find in both countries social, economic, legal and administrative, and religious characteristics that indicate a remarkable degree of coincidence both in content and vocabulary⁶³.

The Iranian pattern emerges particularly clearly in the crucial realm of political theory. "Brother of the Sun and Moon", the Iranian King of kings was not only a hereditary ruler, but a *deus natus*⁶⁴. In both the Avestan religious tradition and the Iranian Epic Cycles, the legitimate king was constantly identified and accompanied by divine and occasionally

visible attributes: divine guidance or fate, and supernatural glory⁶⁵. These indispensable attributes which both singled out and protected the legitimate king, abandoning him only when his sins made him unworthy of it, can be subsumed in the formula, *baxt*⁶⁶ *u xwarrah*⁶⁷, rendered into Greek as *μοῖρα καὶ τύχη*⁶⁸.

In a famous passage from the *Kārnāmag-i Ardašīr*, the change of dynasty in third century Iran is depicted in the terms of an epic, almost a cinematographic chase. Pursuing the fleeing Ardašīr, the Parthian king Ardawān ritually enquires about the fugitive:

"They arrived here early in the morning", said the inhabitants, "when the sun darted aloft his pointed rays and rode away swiftly like the whirlwind. There ran behind them a ram of great size, than which it is impossible to find a ram more beautiful. We believe that he must have traversed many leagues by this time, and you will not be able to overtake them." On hearing this Ardavān did not tarry there a moment, but marched on with great haste.

When he reached another place he asked the people at what time the two riders had passed... They said that a midday they passed by like the whirlwind and a ram ran alongside of them. Ardavān exclaimed with astonishment: "Verily we know the two riders but what can this ram be". He inquired of the High Priest, who replied: "It is the Kingly Glory: it has not yet completely reached him, and until then we should hasten in pursuit of him; it is perhaps possible that we may be able to capture him before the Glory reaches him." Ardavān... proceeded onwards with the utmost speed.

Next day... they met a caravan on the way. Ardavān asked the men in the caravan where they had met the two riders. They responded: "between you and them there is a distance of twenty — one leagues. We so noticed that on the horse of one of the riders sat a ram of great size and activity." Ardavān asked the High Priest what the ram which sat with him on the horse signified. "May you be immortal", replied the High Priest, "the Kingly Glory has reached Artakshīr. He cannot now be captured, do what you will..."⁶⁹.

Protected by the divine glory of the *xwarrah*, Ardašīr is now both legitimate and invincible.

The identical divine attributes — *baxt u p'ark'* in Armenian — legitimize and distinguish the Armenian Arsacids even in the works of Christian writers. Thus, in his presumed edict cited in the *History* of "Agat'angelos", Trdat the Great invokes blessings on his land:

... may there be protection [for us] from our heroic Parthians, from the glory (*p'ark'*) of [our] kings, and from [our] valiant ancestors⁷⁰.

Similarly, the fifth century historian, P'awstos Buzand, reporting the great invasion of Šāhpuhr II, explains:

... [The Persians] opening the tombs of the first Armenian kings, the valiant Arsacids, removed their bones and carried them off as trophies so that the glory (*p'ark'*) and the fortune (*baxt*)... of these kings should pass with their remains to... [the Persian] land⁷¹.

Bearing this in mind, we can now take one more step back chronologically. A fresh reading of the famous passage in Dio Cassius describing the coronation of Trdat I by Nero, reveals that the Armenians were familiar with the precise Iranian formulation of royal ideology even in the earlier Parthian times. Addressing Nero, Trdat acknowledges himself his servant and adds:

Master, I am the descendant of Arsaces, brother of the Kings Vologaesius and Pacorus, and thy slave. And I have come to thee, my god, to worship thee as I do Mithra. The destiny thou spinnest for me shall be mine; for thou art my Glory and my Fate [*σὺ γάρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα εἰ καὶ τύχη*]⁷².

In this repetition of the Iranian terminology, then, we have evidence not only of one more aspect of the Iranian character of Arsacid Armenia, but a significant chronological index as well. The political theory known to us from the surviving Persian sources only from late Sasanian times is attested on the Armenian side from a far earlier Parthian period. Consequently, just as the linguistic evidence has demonstrated that

Iranian loan words in Armenian should be derived from Middle Parthian rather than Middle Persian⁷³, so the political theory and a number of other corroborative aspects suggest that Arsacid Armenia remained a semi-anachronistic society perpetuating Parthian traditions and institutions late into the Sasanian period.

Little trace can, for instance, be found in the Armenian sources of the fourth (third) estate or class, that is to say secretaries and scribes, whose appearance is usually attributed by Persian sources to the Sasanians. This discrepancy between the two neighboring patterns may be due in part to the assumption of chancellery duties by the Christian clergy, but it seems more likely, in the light of other indications, that this is an index of Armenia's failure to develop the massive bureaucratic machinery of the Sasanian state. The Armenian rulers undoubtedly sought to achieve the centralization and rigid hierarchy praised in the *Letter of Tansar* and the *Testament of Ardašīr*⁷⁴ and to obtain the revenue derived from the Sasanian's elaborate system of taxation, but their attempts to differentiate between office and rank, to regularize the order of precedence within the nobility to control the disposition of land and, most important of all, to make the King's grant, or at least his ratification, the basis for both land tenure and dignity, in short to break the hereditary rights of the magnates, usually remained dead letter.

The normal pattern which emerges from the Armenian sources throughout the Arsacid period is for the returning exile to take automatic possession of his ancestral domain, despite royal confiscation⁷⁵, for the senior member of a clan to take precedence, even where this dignity and its privileges had specifically been granted by the King to another⁷⁶; for the successor of a magnate to assume his father's office without awaiting the King's sanction, even when he was unable to discharge its duties because of his youth or other impediment⁷⁷. Neither ability nor the King's manifest will could breach the massive wall of hereditary rights and privileges. Far from fading as it seems to have done in Sasanian Persia, the power of the council of

the nobles grew in Armenia until it presented a continuous check on the King and a threat to the stability of the realm⁷⁸. Faced with the entrenched arrogance of the "lords with contingents and banners"⁷⁹, the King had no recourse but to try and keep the more turbulent and powerful among them under his eye at court⁸⁰ while maneuvering among their peers until a rare conjunction of circumstances allowed him to extirpate a particularly threatening clan to the last infant⁸¹. No further advance from the level of what Toumanoff has termed "dynasticism" to the more centralized pattern of "feudalism" could apparently be made⁸².

An explanation for this failure of Armenia to develop the power of the ruler as against the Sasanian success may perhaps be sought in the blood feud with which I began this paper. The spokesman of the Armenian magnates, the Mamikonean *sparapet* may have repeatedly sworn allegiance to his native lord, but this allegiance was contingent on the ruler's being an Arsacid, the house to which the crown and *p'ark'* belonged by right in accordance with the Parthian concept of hereditary office. But what was the definition of an Arsacid in Armenia? A revealing if apocryphal dialogue opposing the Armenian King Varazdat and the *sparapet* Manuēl Mamikonean in the *History of P'awtos Buzand* provides a solution. Outraged by the King's usurpation of the prerogatives of his family Manuēl accuses him:

"You are no true Arsacid, you are nothing but a bastard child, that is why you have not acknowledged the faithful servants of the Arsacids... The first Arsacids knew very well who we were... but as for you, since you are no Arsacid, go from this land lest you die by my hand."

to which Varazdat replies:

"If I am no Arsacid how did I assume the crown of my Arsacid ancestors, how did I take the lands of my predecessors and avenge my uncle, Pap...⁸³?"

The answer is clear and so is the *sparapet's* threat. To be entitled to the allegiance which none but the Arsacids can command the King, locked in by *noblesse oblige*, must

7c

accept the responsibilities and duties of his house. His *actions* are the touchstone of his *legitimacy*. But these actions include not only the obligation of the blood feud, but the maintenance intact of all the hereditary prerogatives which guarantee his own. By accepting the Arsacid inheritance, without which he had no claim to the throne, the Armenian King found himself facing simultaneously the eternal necessity of defying Persia in the name of avenging his Arsacid ancestors and the impossibility of solidifying his position at home. The situation was clearly without issue. Trapped between foreign invasion and civil war the Armenian kingdom understandably collapsed. Yet in the midst

of this political catastrophe, the Arsacids' enforced maintenance of the whole nexus of Parthian clan institutions long after their alteration in Iran ensured the survival of this social structure. Hence, it seems permissible to hazard the hypothesis that a further study of the Iranian components in Arsacid Armenia should provide a guide not only for its own history, but also for an investigation of the Parthian period of Iranian history eradicated from the Persian sources by the antagonism of its Sasanian successors, and simultaneously for a study of the gradual de-Hellenization of the Eastern regions of Asia Minor and the consequent shift in the Oriental cultural balance long before the advent of the Arab invasions.

¹ Ammianus Marcellinus, *Rerum gestarum libri qui supersunt*, J. C. Rolfe ed. and tr., 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1939—1950) [= AM], XXV, vii, 12—13; cf. XX, xi, 1. On the probable causes of Aršak II's collaboration with Constantinus, see my article, «Politique ou orthodoxie? L'Arménie au quatrième siècle», *Revue des études arméniennes* [= REArm], n. s. IV (1967), especially pp. 297—298, 304—305.

² Tacitus, *Annales*, J. Jackson ed. and tr., 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1951), [= Ann.], II, lvi; cf. XIII, xxxiv.

³ P'awtos Buzand, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, K'[erovbe] P[atkanean] ed. (Tiflis, 1912) [= P'B], IV, liv, see the entire beginning of this chapter leading to the summary p. 254 [= V. Langlois, ed. *Collection des historiens anciens et modernes de l'Arménie* = CHAMA (Paris, 1869), I, pp. 269—271].

⁴ Agat'angelos, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, G. Tēr Mkrtčean and S. Kanayean' edd. (Tiflis, 1909) [= Aa], xviii—xix, pp. 15—17. [= CHAMA I, pp. 114—115]. A far better translation by Prof. R. Thomson of Harvard University is now in press. Approximately the same account of Xosrov's epic revenge is given in the Greek version of "Agat'angelos" *History*, G. Lafontaine, ed., *La Version grecque ancienne du livre arménien d'Agathange* (Louvain, 1973 [= Ag.], ix b—x, pp. 178—179).

On Asorestan, see J. Markwart, *Ērānšahr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac'i* (Berlin, 1901) [= Ērānšahr], p. 21 n. 2; and H. Honigsmann and A. Maricq, *Recherches sur les Res Gestae Divi Saporis* (Brussels, 1952) [= RGDS], pp. 41—63.

⁵ Far from being an isolated thesis limited to this case alone, the theme of the Arsacid blood vengeance is ubiquitous in early Armenian

literature. It is repeated from generation to generation in P'B, specifically in the threats of Aršak II to Šāhpuhr II mentioned above in n. 3, P'B, IV, liv, p. 154 [= CHAMA I, p. 271]; in P'B, III, xx, p. 78 [= CHAMA I, p. 230] regarding Aršak II's father Tiran; and in P'B, V, xxxvii, p. 360 [= CHAMA I, p. 299] regarding king Varazdat's rejection of the accusations of the *sparapet*, Manuēl Mamikonean. The same theme occurs in Anak's deceitful promise of revenge to Xosrov, Aa xxix, p. 21 [= CHAMA I, p. 119]; as well as in the praise of Trdat for avenging his ancestors, Aa, cxxiii, p. 72 [= CHAMA I, p. 133]. Subsequently, the same theme of vengeance is picked up in Łazar P'arpec'i's brief summary of Agat'angelos, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, G. Tēr Mkrtčean and S. Malxasean edd. (Tiflis, 1904) [= ŁP'], ii, p. 2 [= CHAMA II, p. 259]; in Movsēs Xorenac'i, *Patmut'iwn Hayoc'*, M. Abelean and S. Yarut'iwn' edd. (Tiflis, 1913) [= MX], II, lxviii, pp. 202—203. [= Moise de Khorène, *Histoire d'Arménie*, P. E. Le Vaillant de Florival ed. and tr. (Venice, 1841) = MK], I, pp. 320/1—322/3, who likewise summarizes Agat'angelos at this point but also elaborates the earlier account, II, lxxi—lxxiii, pp. 207—210 [= MK, I, pp. 316/7—322/3; and even in Ps. Zenob Glak, *Patmut'iwn Tarōnay*, 2nd. ed. (Venice, 1889) [= ZG] p. 20 [= CHAMA I, p. 342], etc. For the events described, see C. Toumanoff, "The Third Century Armenian Arsacids: a Chronological and Genealogical Commentary", REArm, n. s. VI (1969), pp. 249—251.

⁶ Tac. *Ann.*, XII, 1; likewise, XV, ii. The relationship is corroborated by Dio Cassius, *Roman History*, E. Cary ed. and tr. (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1955) [= DC], LXIII, v, 1—2, and LXII, xxiii, 1. Cf. MX I, viii—ix, p. 29 [= MK, I, pp. 38/9—40/1], also II, i; iii; lxviii,

pp. 101, 104, 203—204 [= MK, I, pp. 139/40, 142/3, 310/1. Unlike Aa, xviii—xix, Ag, ix, p. 178 insists that Xosrov of Armenia and Artabanus of Parthia were likewise brothers, and not merely kinsmen, cf. Ag, x, p. 179, a version which is also repeated by ZG, p. 20 [= CHAMA I, p. 342]. Cf. Toumanoff, *loc. cit.*, pp. 242—243, et passim, as well as M. van Esbroeck, «Le roi Sanatrouk et l'apôtre Thaddée», *REArm*, n. s. IX (1972), pp. 241—266, for the problems surrounding the accession of the Arsacids in Armenia and for their successors.

⁷ An exhaustive bibliography of earlier studies cannot be attempted here. There is no doubt that considerable work has already been done, particularly in the domain of linguistics, by P. de Lagarde, H. Hübschmann, A. Meillet, H. Ačaryan, E. Benveniste, G. Dumézil, H. W. Bailey, W. B. Henning, G. Bolognesi, and many others; that the religious and mythological as well as epic influences in Armenia have been considered to some degree by F. Cumont and J. MU. Unvala, more elaborately by Ė. Ališan, H. Gelzer, G. Xalatean, V. V. Barthold, M. Abelean, J. A. Orbeli, K. Melik'-Ōhanjanyan, and more recently by M. Boyce, B. Čukaszyan, J. de Menasce, G. Wikander, G. Widengren, et al; that the "feudal" institution of Arsacid Armenia have been extensively studied; that some work has been done in Armenian Arsacid archaeology, law, and social structure, albeit not political theory. Some of these aspects will be discussed below. Despite nearly a century of development, however, none of these aspects has been exhausted, some branches, such as archaeology and law, are in their infancy, and to my knowledge no attempt at any synthesis has been made.

⁸ P. Peeters, «L'Intervention politique de Constance II dans la Grande Arménie», *Académie Royale de Belgique. Classe des Lettres*, XVII (1931) repr. in *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientale* (Brussels, 1951), I, pp. 242—243; also my article, «Armenia in the Fourth Century. An Attempt to Re-define the Concepts 'Armenia' and 'Loyalty'», *REArm*, n. s. VIII (1971), pp. 342—343 and n. 5. The reluctance to acknowledge Iranian components in Armenian culture has shown remarkable persistence. Once laid down, it has survived some fifteen centuries to reach into the present.

⁹ It scarcely seems necessary to underscore that Classical (Greek and Roman) as well as Christian influences were indeed present in Armenia, since this is its most familiar side. Sources, such as Strabo, Tacitus, Dio Cassius, Ammianus Marcellinus, and others, speak of the relations between Armenia and the Classical world. Most scholars, perhaps as a result of their classical training, have focused on this aspect. In his recent chapter, «Die armenische Sprache», in the *Handbuch der Orientalistik*,

Bd. VII (Leiden, 1963), G. R. Solta, gives almost all of his attention to the links of Armenian with Greek. The unmistakable Greek antecedents to be found in early Armenian literature were studied by H. Manandyan, *Hunaban dproc'a* (Vienna 1928) and continue to be carefully and accurately traced by Profs. G. Garitte at Louvain and R. Thomson at Harvard. The archaeological evidence of the temple at Ga'ni, of the classical figures recently found in the excavations of Artaxata-Neroniana, as well as those found further north at Mtsxeta, A. Apakidze et al., *Mtsxeta*, I (Tbilisi, 1958), pp. 69 sq. and pls. vii—viii, lx, all give visible proof of the presence of Classical culture in Armenia. The very conversion of Arsacid Armenia to Christianity and its faithful adherence to the new faith must of necessity have turned the country away from the Zoroastrian world of Iran, although I have had the occasion to express certain reservations as to this dichotomy in «Armenia and Loyalty», pp. 346—352; «Politique ou orthodoxie?», pp. 300—301; and «Le Rôle de l'hierarchie chrétienne dans les rapports diplomatiques entre Byzance et les Sassanides», *REArm*, n. s. X (1973/4), pp. 175—194. Vide infra n. 13.

¹⁰ The double linguistic tradition was noted from the beginning in Armenian literature: Koriwn, *Vark' Maštoc'i*, N. Akinean ed. (Vienna, 1962), IX, vi, p. 28; Aa dcccxi, pp. 437—438 [= CHAMA I, p. 179]; ĖP', I, x, p. 13 [= CHAMA II, pp. 265—267]; and MX, III, liv, pp. 328—329 [= MK, II, pp. 82/3—84/5]. Likewise, the journey of Maštoc' to Edessa as well as to Constantinople, Koriwn, vi—ix; ĖP', I, p. 15 n. 3; MX III, lii sq., lvii, pp. 326—327, 332—335 [= MK, II, pp. 132/3—138/9, 148/9—152/3], etc. The bilingual tradition reached further north than Armenia, as is demonstrated by the famous bilingual inscription of Armazi near Mtsxeta, *Mtsxeta*, pp. 69—72 and pls. lx—lxi. All these aspects have been treated by E. Tēr Minassiantz, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zu der syrischen Kirche* (Leipzig, 1904); T. Tēr Mikelian, *Die armenische Kirche in ihren Beziehungen zur byzantinischen* (Leipzig, 1892); M. Abelean, *Hayoc' hin grakanut'yan patmut'yun* (repr. in *Erker*, III, Erevan, 1968), pp. 81—102; N. Adontz, *Armenia in the Period of Justinian*, N. Garsoïan ed. and tr. (Louvain — Lisbon, 1970, pp. 269—275; P. Peeters, «Pour l'histoire des origines de l'alphabet arménien», *REArm*, IX (1929), repr. in *Recherches d'histoire et de philologie orientale*, I (Brussels, 1951); A. Perikhanian, «K voprusu o proiskhozhdenii armianskoï pis'mennosti», *Peredneaziatskii Sbornik*, II (Moscow, 1966); H. G. Melik'yan, *Hay-asorakan haraberut'yunneri patmut'yunic'* (Erevan, 1970); E. G. Ter-Minasyan, «Hayoc' hin grabar grakanut'yan cagumn u caikman šrjan», *Patma-banasirakan hetazotut'yunner* (Erevan, 1971), pp. 280—329, et al.; see

also my *Paulician Heresy* (the Hague, 1967), pp. 220—226.

¹¹ B. N. Arak'elyan, «Osnovnye rezul'taty raskopok drevnego Artashata», *Patma-Banasirakan Handes* [= PBH] (1974/4), pp. 44—60, figs. 5, 10. The significance of these rider figures will be discussed elsewhere.

¹² *Ašxarhaç'oyc' [PS] Movsesi Xorenac'woy* (Venice, 1881) [= AG]; cf. S. T. Eremyan, *Hayastana ast Ašxarhaç'oyc'* (Erevan, 1963) [= Armenia], Introduction. The ultimate authorship of this work, which has been attributed and taken away from Movsēs Xorenac'i and Anania Širakac'i, does not concern us here.

¹³ The presence of Epic elements in early Armenian literature has been observed, primarily by Russian and Armenian scholars, such as Xalatean, Abelean, Barthold, Orbeli, Melik' Ōhanjanyan, Čukaszyan, and others, vide infra n. 61. This aspect will be developed further in my forthcoming article, "The *Locus* of the Death of Kings in Early Armenian Historiography", a paper presented to the Oriental Club of New York, December, 1974. For the alteration of standard hagiographic patterns, see another of my articles to appear shortly, "Iranian Themes in the *History* of Ps. Agat'angelos".

¹⁴ This was astutely noted by Tacitus, *Ann.*, XIII, xxxiv, despite his comments, *Ann.*, II, lvi on Armenia's ambiguous stand noted above.

¹⁵ As I have already stated, the purpose of this paper is not so much to break new ground as to juxtapose the mass of existing evidence to demonstrate its volume. A treatment in depth of any aspect would require space far in excess of what is possible here. It must consequently await the book of which this synthesis is but the harbinger.

¹⁶ DC LXVIII, xvii, 1. although Trajan is made to say subsequently that Armenia was part of his empire. DC LXVIII, xx, 3. Even there, Dio Cassius notes that Armenia was to have a Roman governor thenceforth and consequently it could not have been an integral part of the Roman empire from ancient times. Thereafter, he returns to the theme of conquest and, moreover, stresses in the same context that the Armenian ruler Parthamasiris was a Parthian by blood as had been Tiridates [Trdat] I, DC, LXIII, v, 1—2.

¹⁷ The position of Armenia as part of Ērān or Anērān is variable. The great inscription of Darius the Great at Behistun, R. G. Kent, *Old Persian*, 2nd. rev. ed. (New Haven, 1953) [= OP], DB I, 6. i, 12—17, p. 119, states officially: "These are the countries which came unto me by favour of Ahuramazda, I was king of them: Persia, Elam, ... Media, Armenia, Cappadocia, Parthia, ... in all xxiii provinces", cf. pp. 136, 151 (Xerxes), 156 (Artaxerxes II/III). In his inscription at Naqš-i Rostam, however, *Ibid.*, iii, 15—30,

p. 138, Darius notes that, "...these are the countries which I seized outside Persia; I ruled over them; they bore tribute to me; ... Media, Elam, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Choras-mia, ... Armenia Cappadocia, ...". For the later Classical authors, such as DC LXXX, iii, 2—4, Armenia was part of the Iranian ancestral domain.

Armenia remains outside of Ērānšahr in the inscription of the third century A. D. attributed to the high priest Kartir on the Ka'ba-yi Zardūšt [=KKZ], M. Sprengling, *Third Century Iran Sapor and Kartir* (Chicago, 1953) [= Iran], pp. 51—52, "...the territory of non-Iran, wherever the horses and men of the King of Kings arrived... the country of Armenia, Georgia (Vrkan, Iberia) and Albania, and Balasakan until forward to the Alans' pass, Shahpur King of Kings... visited with... pillaging and firing and havoc, — there also I by command of the King of Kings those magimen and fires... which were for these countries put... in order", similarly in the Naqš-i Rostam version [=KNR], C. J. Brunner, "The Middle Persian Inscription of the Priest Kirdēr at Naqš-i Rostam", *Studies in Honor of George C. Miles*, D. K. Kouymjian ed. (Beirut, 1974), xxxvii—xli, pp. 107—108. The same is true of the inscription of Narseh at Paikuli, E. Herzfeld, *Paikuli* (Berlin, 1924), I, pp. 97, 99, 103. This point of view is shared by R. Frye, *The Heritage of Persia* (Cleveland—New York, 1953 [= Frye, Persia], p. 202, "...Eranshar... included Mesopotamia but not Armenia".

On the other hand, other epigraphic and literary materials of the period included Armenia within the Ērānšahr, viz. the victory inscription of Šāhpuhr I on the Ka'ba-yi Zardūšt [SKZ], Sprengling, *Iran*, p. 14, ii, "Of the Aryan empire (Parth. *Aryankhshatr*; Greek, *to Arianōn ethnos*; MP probably, *Iranshatr*) the principalities and provinces... (are) these: Pars... Parthia... Atrūpatkān... Armenia, Vīrchān (Greek *Iberia*)... Ardān (Greek *Albania*; MP probably *Arrān*), Balasakān..., until forward to the Kap mountains (i. e. the *Caucasus*) and the Alan's gate...". ~~the~~ Greek version is identical, A. Maricq, «Res gestae divi Saporis», *Classica et Orientalia* (Paris, 1965) [= Maricq, RGDS], ii-iii, pp. 46/7—48/9, and Honigsmann, *RGDS*, pp. 39—40. Frye, *Persia*, p. 206 agrees, "that most of Transcaucasia was included in his empire... [although] Shapur did not inherit these lands from his father but had to conquer them...". Agreeing with SKZ, *The Letter of Tansar* (Rome, 1968), whose translator M. Boyce (pp. 16—22) accepts it as a genuine third century document, states categorically, p. 63, "...the earth has four parts... the fourth part... is called Persia... from the river of Balkh up to the furthestmost borders of the land of Ādar-bāigan and of Persarmenia, ...". Finally, in a

later period, AG also includes Armenia within the Persian realm, xxix, pp. 40/53. Cf Markwart, *Ērānšahr*, pp. 9—10, 17, 94—122, especially 114; Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 165—182, etc. Thus, despite some disagreement, which may be explained on religious grounds in the case of Kartir, most sources, Classical and Armenian, as well as some Persian, assign Armenia to the Iranian realm. Historically, the geopolitical terms of both Nero's compromise of Rhandaia and the partition of 387 left the vast majority of the Armenian lands (ca. 4/5) on the Persian side. See also the following notes.

¹⁸ The status of Armenia as the ancestral domain of the Parthians as well as the Sasanians was noted by both Tacitus, *Ann.* XII, 1, and Dio Cassius, *CD*, LXXX, iii, 2—4. Its grant to members of the royal family is likewise attested by Oriental as well as Classical sources, e. g. 1) Orodes, Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, XVIII, iv § 52; 2) Tiridates I, Tac. *Ann.*, XII, 1; XIII, xxxiv; XV, ii; DC, LXII, xxiii; LXIII, v, 1—2; 3) Parthamasiris, DC, LXVIII, xxii, 2; 4) Hormizd-Ardašir son of Šāhpuhr I, *SKZ*, Sprengling, *Iran*, iv, p. 17, "... we found(ed) on fire, Good fame of Öhrmizd-Artakshatr by name, for Öhrmizd-Artakshatr's, Great King of the Armenians (Armenia) our son's soul (memory) and after-name (name-preservation)...", also *SKZ*, iv, 5, pp. 17—18; 5) Narseh son of Šāhpuhr I, *Paikuli*, I, pp. 98—99, 11. 9—10; see W. B. Henning, "A Farewell to the Kaghan of the Aq-Aqatāran", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*, pp. 517—518; 6) Aršak and Vālašēs and his son Tigran, *MX*, I, viii, p. 29 [= *MK*, I, p. 39/40—41/2]; II, xi, p. 121 [= *MK*, I, p. 170/1], etc.; 7) Xosrov, *LP*, viii, p. 11 [= *CHAMA* II, pp. 261—262]. See also Toumanoff, *loc. cit.*, pp. 253—254. 261, and R. Grousset, *Histoire de l'Arménie des origines à 1071* (Paris, 1947), p. 179, who speaks of Armenia as the apanage of the Sasanian "dauphin". Finally, even Darius III had come from the governorship of Armenia much earlier to claim the ill fated throne of the Achaemenian King of kings, Justin *Epitoma historiarum Philippicarum*, E. and L. Chambry edd. and tr. (Paris, s. d.) [= *Epitoma*] X, iii, 3—5; see also Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliothecae historicae quae supersunt*, XVII, v—vi. Vide supra n. 6.

¹⁹ *SKZ*, Sprengling, *Iran*, iii, 2, p. 15, "Then ... Caesar, secondly, ... lied and did wrong to Armenia. And we upon the Roman's empire ... made an attack and (the) Roman's forces, 60,000 ..., at Barbalissus slaughtered".

²⁰ a) Kartir, *KKZ*, Sprengling, *Iran*, pp. 51—52, 11. 12—13 = *KNR*, xl—xli, p. 108. (Vide supra n. 17 for the text).

b) Yazdgard III — Mihr Nerseh, *L. P.*, II, xx—xxiii, pp. 40—44 sqq. [= *CHAMA* II, pp. 278—285sqq.]; *Elisē*, *Vasn Vardanay ew Hayoc' paterazmi*, E. Tēr Minasean ed. (Erevan,

1957) [= *Elisē*], ii—iii, pp. 14—71 [= *CHAMA* II, pp. 190—206.]. See also M. Grignaschi, «Quelques spécimens de la littérature sassanide conservés dans les bibliothèques d'Istanbul», *Journal Asiatique* (1966) [= *Littérature*], p. 140, 7^o; et al.

²¹ The King of Armenia always seems to have been singled out for a position of special distinction in the Persian realm, whether he was second after the King of kings, as is claimed by *Aa*, xviii, p. 15 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 114]; *MX*, II, xi, lxviii, p. 121, 203—204 [= *MK*, I, pp. 170/1, 310/1]; or merely third, as in Tac. *Ann.*, XV, ii, cf. *P'B*, IV, xvi, pp. 192—193 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 254]; or even fourth, "Primary History" in Sebēos, *Patmut'iwn Sebēosi episkoposi i Herakln* (St. Petersburg, 1879) [= *Sebēos*], p. 9. He is likewise singled out in *SKZ* as "Great king" as against his brothers who are listed merely as "kings", Sprengling, *Iran*, p. 8, 1. 18 — p. 9, 1. 20; p. 23, 11. 23, 25; pp. 17—18, iv, 2, 5, = Maricq, *RGDS*, xli—xlili, pp. 58—59. Although Adontz, *Armenia*, p. 434 n. 10 (based on Ibn Khurra-dādhbih) and Eremyan, *Armenia*, p. 66 n. 1 (based on Henning, "Farewell to the Kaghan of the Aq-Aqatāran", p. 517 n. 4) turn the formula into *Wuzurg Armenān šāh*, "King of Greater Armenia", as it may have become at a later date, the text of *SZK* clearly seems to associate the qualifier "great" with the noun "king" and not with "Armenia". Finally, *P'B*, IV, xvi, p. 193 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 254] insists on the precise identity of the regalia and honours to which the Persian and Armenian kings were entitled on state occasions, for which vide infra n. 58.

²² The identification of the Armenian rulers with the Arsacid house is ubiquitous: *P'B*, III, xi, p. 44 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 227]; V, viii, p. 312 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 287]; V, xix, p. 317 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 289]; *Aa* xxii, p. 19 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 117], but missing in *Ag*, xi, p. 180; cxxxi, pp. 75—76 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 135]; dcclxxxiii, p. 407 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 166]. The name could be given to non-Arsacids to give them legitimacy, *P'B*, IV, xv, lx, pp. 187, 260 [= *CHAMA* I, 252, 274], cf. *MX* II, xxxvii, p. 162 [= *MK*, I, p. 238/9]; *MX*, II, xlvi, p. 173 [= *MK*, I, p. 258/9]. The association could furthermore be extended to the court, *Aa*, xii, p. 10 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 107]; to the royal family, both the queen, *P'B*, V, xliii, p. 378 [= *CHAMA* I, pp. 304—305] and the royal princes, *P'B*, V, xxxvi, p. 365 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 300], and V, xlv, p. 383 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 305]. Finally, at the end of the Armenian kingdom, almost any candidate could be designated as King of Armenia by either Byzantium or the Sasanians as long as it was clear that he was a member of the Arsacid house. Vide infra n. 27.

The Classical sources on their side support this identification, Tac. *Ann.*, XV, i, "... rex Parthorum Vologese cognitis... regem<que>

alienigenam Tigranen Armeniae impositum, simul fratre Tiridate pulso spretum Arsacidarum fastigium ire ultum volens, ..."; cf. DC, LXIII, v, 2; LXVIII, xix, 4; etc.

²³ P'B, IV, li, p. 246 [= CHAMA I, pp. 267—268]. Cf. the comment of ŁP', I, viii, p. 11 [= CHAMA II, p. 264], which, however, is probably no more than a pious echo of the curse of Aršak II by Nersēs I, P'B, IV, xv, p. 186 [= CHAMA I, p. 252].

²⁴ Thus, note the care taken by King Erwand to convince the Persian ruler that the young Artasēs was not of royal blood, MX, II, xxxviii, pp. 163—164 [= MK, I, p. 250/1]; cf. II, xliii, p. 168 [= MK, I, p. 242/3], as well as the limits set to the ambition of Bakour, who could not aspire to be king since he was not an Arsacid, MX III, iv, p. 260 [= MK, II, p. 8/9].

²⁵ P'B, IV, xxiv, pp. 220—221 [= CHAMA I, p. 261]; III, xi, p. 44 [= CHAMA I, p. 227]; V, xx, p. 318 [= CHAMA I, p. 289]; xxxvii, pp. 359—360 [= CHAMA I, p. 299]; V, xliv, pp. 384—385 [= CHAMA I, pp. 305—306], etc.

²⁶ Vide supra n. 5.

²⁷ P'B, VI, i, pp. 391—392 [= CHAMA I, p. 307]; MX, III, xlii, p. 311 [= MK, II, pp. 102/3—104/5]; xliii, pp. 311—312 [= MK, II, pp. 104/5—106/7]; ŁP', I, vi, p. 8 [= CHAMA II, p. 262]; I, ix, p. 13 [= CHAMA II, p. 265]; I, xiii, p. 19 [= CHAMA II, p. 268].

The same policy was followed by the Byzantine empire to ensure the loyalty of its portion of Armenia, P'B, V, xxxiv, p. 350 [= CHAMA I, p. 297]; MX III, xl, p. 307 [= MK, II, p. 96/7]. It is interesting that neither Varazdat nor Xosrov (or for that matter his brother Aršak) seem to have been considered as personally distinguished since both sources refer to them as *niš* "a certain"; the purity of their Arsacid blood line seems to have been sufficient to make them acceptable candidates for the Armenian throne. The King of kings Yazdgard I seems to have been quite aware of the danger for Persia of this allegiance of the Armenians to the Parthian royal house. He consequently attempted to redirect the loyalty of the country by giving it a king from his own family, ŁP', I, xii, p. 18 [= CHAMA I, p. 268], but the young prince whom he enthroned "*ի տեղի Արշակունյան*" was murdered on the very day of his father's death, *Idem*.

²⁸ The common designation of St. Gregory the Illuminator as "Part'ew" is sufficiently indicative of this descent, which is most clearly spelled out in MX II, xci, p. 246 [= MK, I, p. 380/1]; II, xxvii, xxviii, pp. 145, 146 [= MK, I, p. 210/1]; lxxiv, p. 211 [= MK, I, p. 324/5]. See also Aa, xxv—xxvi, p. 20 [= CHAMA I, pp. 118—119] = Ag, xiii, p. 181, who specifies that Gregory's father Anak was King Xosrov's kinsman; and Aa, cxxi—cxxii, pp. 70—71 [= CHAMA I, pp. 132—133], where Tačat reveals to King Trdat

that Gregory is the son of Anak, etc. See also, C. Toumanoff, *Studies in Christian Caucasian History* (Georgetown, 1963) [= *Studies*], xi, p. 218; and K. Melik'-Öhanjanyan, "Agat'angelosi bannahusakan ałbiwrneri harc'i šurj", *PBH* (1964/4) [= *Agat'angelos*], pp. 60—65, 74—77.

It is interesting to note in this connexion that the promise made by Ardašir that he would return to Anak the inheritance of his fathers and make him the "second" in his realm, "*Երկրորդ ինձ կուհցից*", Aa, xxvi p. 20 [= CHAMA I, p. 118—119], cf. xxx, p. 21 [= CHAMA I, p. 119], is not one of the standard clichés for royal promises. It is a specific reference to the hereditary position of the Sūrēn in Arsacid Persia, i. e. to the family to which Anak belonged: Plutarch, *Lives*, B. Perrin tr. Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1958, "Crassus", xxi, "... οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν τῶν τυχοῦντων ὁ Σουρήνας, ἀλλὰ πλοῦτος μὲν καὶ γένει καὶ δόξῃ μέγα βασιλεία δεύτερος..."; also AM, XXX, ii, 5, "...advenit Surena potestatis secundae post regem, ..."; XXIV, ii, 4. MX II, xxviii, p. 146 [= MK I, p. 210/1] seems to suggest that the Sūrēn took a slightly lower position following after the Kāren although both families were collateral branches of the Arsacid house. See A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanides*, 2e ed. (Copenhagen, 1944) [= *Iran*], pp. 20, 103, etc. On the title of "Second" after the king, see E. Benveniste, *Titres et noms propres en Iranien ancien* (Paris, 1967) [= *Titres*], pp. 51—58.

²⁹ MX II, xxvii—xxviii, pp. 145—146 [= MK I, p. 210/1]; II, lxxii—lxxiii, pp. 209—210 [= MK I, pp. 320/1—322/3]. The Armenian sources acknowledge that the Kamsarakans were the highest after the king, MX III, x, p. 268 [= MK II, p. 22/3/]; that they were entitled to marry into the Arsacid house, MX III, xxxi, p. 295 [= MK II, pp. 70/1—72/3]; and that they were themselves of Arsacid blood, MX III, xlviii, pp. 318—319 (= MK II, pp. 118/9—120/1); MX II, xlii, p. 167 [= MK I, p. 248/9] and III, lxxv, p. 352 [= MK II, p. 183/4], on which see Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 210—212, 447 n. 42, and 509 nn. 23, 25; also Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 206—207.

³⁰ MX III, li, pp. 322—324 [= MK II, pp. 128/9—130/1]; cf. ŁP', I, xiv, p. 23 [= CHAMA II, p. 271].

³¹ On the Iranian descent, especially in the Kamsarakan line, of the families of the Rop'sean, Abelean, Gabelean, Hawnuni, Spanduni, etc., see Toumanoff, *Studies*, xxii, p. 213; i, vi—vii, ix, pp. 220—221, etc., and supra n. 29.

³² As noted above, nn. 7, 23, only a token listing of the vast bibliography on Armeno-Iranian linguistics can be given here. The classic studies of H. Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, I (Leipzig, 1895) [= *Grammatik*] and A. Meillet, «De l'influence parthe sur la langue arménienne», *REArm*, I/1 (1920), pp. 4—14;

Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique, 2e ed. (Vienna, 1936), and *Etudes de linguistique et de philologie arménienne* (Lisbon, 1962), etc. should still be consulted. Despite the need for a number of corrections, H. Ačaryan's great etymological dictionary, *Hayeren armatakan bařaran*, 7 vols. (Erevan, 1926–1935; in process of reprinting) [= *Etymology*], remains a perpetual source of references. More recently, see the numerous studies of H. W. Bailey, W. B. Henning, and G. Dumézil's series of etymologies in the *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique*, the *Transactions of the Philological Society*, and *REArm*, both series; as well as G. Bolognesi, *Le fonti dialettali degli prestiti iranici in armeno* (Milan [1960]), and «La tradizione culturale armena nelle sue relazioni col mondo Persiano e col mondo Greco-Romano», *La Persia e il Mondo Greco-Romano* (Roma, 1966), pp. 569–603; and, above all, E. Benveniste's innumerable studies (see, *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Emile Benveniste* (Paris, 1975), pp. xi–lii, for an almost exhaustive bibliography compiled by M. Djafar Moïnfar), especially his «Elements parthes en arménien», *REArm*, n. s. I (1964), pp. 1–39; «Etudes iraniennes, III: Emprunts iraniens en arménien», *TSP* (1945–1946), pp. 39–78, «Mots d'emprunts iraniens en arménien», *BSL*, LIII/1 (1957–1958), pp. 55–71, *Titres*, etc.

On social relationships and titles, Adontz's *Armenia* has been seriously challenged and rectified in more recent times, see Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 155–164, et passim, and Ch. Dowsett, «Tēr, Tīkin, Tiezerk», *Mémorial du cinquantenaire de l'Ecole des langues orientales anciennes de l'Institut Catholique de Paris* (Paris, 1964), pp. 135–145. See also R. Frye, *Persia*, pp. 49–52, 182–188, et passim, «Continuing Iranian Influence on Armenia», an offprint from *Yād-Nāme-ye Irān-ye Minorsky* (Tehran, 1969); G. Dumézil, *L'Idéologie tripartite des Indo-Européens* (Brussels, 1958); A. Perikanian, «Notes sur le lexique iranien et arménien», *REArm*, n. s. V (1968), pp. 9–30; and, as always, E. Benveniste, «Titres iraniens en arménien», *REArm*, IX/1 (1929), pp. 5–10, *Titres*, etc.

³³ The classical studies on Armenian toponymy are: AG; H. Hübschmann, *Die altarmenischen Ortsnamen* (Strassburg, 1904; repr. Amsterdam, 1969) [= *Ortsnamen*]; J. Markwart, *Erānšahr, Südarmenien und die Tigrisquellen* (Vienna, 1936), *A Catalogue of the Provincial Capitals of Erānshahr* (Rome, 1931); L. Inčičean, *Hnaxōsut'iwn asyrahagrakan Hayastaneayc' ašxarhi*, 3 vols. (Venice, 1835), and *Storagrut'iwn hin Hayastaneayc'* (Venice, 1822); L. Ališan, *Ayrarat* (Venice, 1890), *Širak* (Venice, 1881), *Sisakan* (Venice, 1893); E. Honigmann, *Die Ostgrenze des byzantinischen Reiches von 363 bis 1071* (Brussels, 1935) [= *Ostgrenze*]; H. Manandyan, *Hayastani gl'awor čanaparhnera est Pewtingeryan k'artezi*

(Erevan, 1936), and *The Trade and Cities of Armenian in Connexion with Ancient World Trade*, N. Garsoïan tr. (Lisbon, 1965); Eremyan, *Armenia*; T. X. Hakobyan, *Hayastani patmakan ašxarhagrut'yun*, 2nd. ed. (Erevan, 1968), et al.

The etymology of *bag-*, OP *baga*, Av *Baya* < Skt *bhāga* is too well known to require commentary, see e. g. OP; Chr. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch* (Strassburg, 1904), s. v.; Ačarean, *Etymology*, 2nd. ed. I, pp. 373–374; Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, p. 113; E. Benveniste, *Les mages dans l'Ancien Iran* (Paris, 1938), pp. 22–23 n. 2, etc. Nor is there any doubt that the contemporaries were aware of the semantic content of this term: Aa, dcccxvii–dcccxviii, p. 426 [= CHAMA I, p. 176] = Ag, cxiii, p. 314, «Լուսա ապա եւ մեծ թագաւորն Տրդատ, եթէ Գրեգոր եկեալ Հասեալ է յերկիրս Հայոց... ընդ առաջ Գրեգորի, զայր Հասանէր ի քաղաքապետն Բագաւան, որ անուանեալ կուի պարթեւարէն լեզուէն Դիցաւան», vide infra n. 36 for other religious associations with Bagawan; see also Benveniste, *Titres*, pp. 79–80 for other compounds of *bag-*.

The province and villages of Bagrewand, Bagaran, Bagawan, etc. are ubiquitous in early Armenian sources, see:

a) Bagrewand/Bagrawand — Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen*, p. 411; Inčičean, *Antiquities*, p. 402; Ališan, *Ayrarat*, pp. 4, 13, 41, 521–525, 552; Adontz, *Armenia*, Appendix V by N. Garsoïan, p. 150*; Eremyan, *Armenia*, pp. 42, 110, 118; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, pp. 21 n. 8, 154, 157, 173, 179, 194, etc.

b) Bagaran (of which we have two homonymous sites) — Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, p. 113, *Ortsnamen*, pp. 410–411; Inčičean, *Antiquities*, pp. 394, 447; Ališan, *Ayrarat*, pp. 64–69, 493, 495; Eremyan, *Armenia*, p. 42, etc.

c) Bagawan — Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, p. 113; *Ortsnamen*, p. 411; Inčičean, *Antiquities*, pp. 326, 406; Ališan, *Ayrarat*, pp. 523, 527–533; Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 241–242 and Appendix V, p. 191*; Eremyan, *Armenia*, pp. 42, 72, etc.

d) Bagaya'ič — Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 113–114, *Ortsnamen*, p. 410; Inčičean, *Antiquities*, p. 24; Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 39–40 and Appendix V, p. 191*; Honigmann, *Ostgrenze*, p. 156; Frye, *Minorsky*, p. 6; G. Widengren, «The Mithraic Mysteries in the Graeco-Roman World with Special Regard to their Iranian Background», *La Persia e il mondo Greco-Romano* (Rome, 1966) [= *Mithraic Mysteries*], p. 435.

See also, Bagnayr, Inčičean, *Antiquities*, p. 511; Bagaračoy dašt, *Ibid.*, p. 25; Bagnac' giwł, Hübschmann, *Ortsnamen*, p. 411; Bagink', Adontz, *Armenia*, p. 16 and Appendix V, p. 191*, Hakobyan, *Geography*, p. 251; and others. The great political and religious capitals: Artaxata/Artašat, Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 22, 211; Vařaršapat/Kainē Polis, *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 97; and Aštišat/

Yaštišat, *Ibid.*, pp. 187—198, as well as Vāršakert, Vasakakert, Vasakašat, Vasakašēn, Vasakawan, *Ibid.*, pp. 79—80, 170—171, 213, 509, and the great district of Vaspurakan, *Ibid.*, p. 80, cf. Frye, *Minorsky*, pp. 2—5, follow the same Iranian pattern.

³⁴ Even a cursory glance through H. Ačaryan's *Hayoc' anjnanunneri bačaran*, 5 vols. (Erevan, 1942—1962; repr. Beirut, 1972), and F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg, 1895; repr. Hildesheim, 1963), s. n. will suffice to indicate the high percentage of Iranian given names found in the Armenian noble houses. Besides the Mamikonean hereditary names cited here (Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 47, 75—77, 80) to which should be added Vahan and Vasak's younger brother Vard, *Ibid.*, p. 82, we find that other great families also preferred Iranian names: the Bagratids, with their numerous Bagarats (*Ibid.*, p. 31), whose prototype appears in the archives of the Parthian early capital of Nisa, I. M. Diakonov and V. D. Lifshits, «Iz materialov parfiaskoi kantselarii „Staroi Nisy”», *Isledovania po istorii i kul'tury narodov vostoka. Sbornik v chest' Akademika I. A. Orbeli* (Moscow, 1960), p. 329 № 1, 2, and whose name may also be linked with Tigran II's governor of Syria, *Bayadates* — a form commonly distorted into *Mayadates* in most editions of Appian's *Roman History*, “The Syrian War” viii, 48—49 — (see Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 198, n. 3, 318—320 and 71; Markwart, *Erānsahr*, pp. 174—175; Adontz, *Armenian*, pp. 318—320; Manandyan, *Trade and Cities*, pp. 56—57, etc.), as well as Varaz-tiroc' whose pro-Persian sympathies were well suited to his name; the Arcrunis, with the notorious Meružan (Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 52—53); the Princes of Siwnik', with their even more disastrous Varaz-Vašan and Vasak (*Ibid.*, pp. 80, 82); the ubiquitous Nersēsēs, the Amatuni's Varaz-Šapuh (*Ibid.*, p. 81), and innumerable others.

As might be expected, the Armenian royal Arsacids never strayed from the Iranian onomastic tradition even after their baptism, viz: Trdat, Xosrov, Tiran, Aršak, Pap, Varazdat, and Vřamšapuh (*Ibid.*, pp. 27, 44, 65—66, 78, 81, 88—89), as well as the queens and princes: Ašžen, Zarmanduxt, Xosroviduxt, Örmazduxt, Varazduxt, Vardanduxt (*Ibid.*, pp. 20, 41, 44, 81, 83), and especially Bambišn, the mother of Nersēs I, whose name is merely a transliteration of the word for queen in Persian (*Ibid.*, p. 32; Benveniste, *Titres*, p. 27, cf. 50, etc.), Gnel, Tirit', etc. But it is more surprising to observe the small impact of what might be called the common Judaeo-Christian onomastic fund on the great ecclesiastical families. Even in the patriarchal house, the early Gregory and final Sahak/Isaac (*Ibid.*, pp. 291, 333—334) are more than balanced by the intervening Rstakēs, Vrt'anēs, Yusik, Pap,

and Nersēs (*Ibid.*, pp. 57, 65—66, Justi, *Namenbuch*, pp. 150, 262, 366, etc.). The depth and persistence of this Iranization may perhaps best be illustrated by the “unsuitable” names of the two presiding hierarchs at the Second Council of Dvin in 555 reaffirming the purity of the Armenian's Christian faith: Nersēs II, kat'olikos of Armenia and Meršapuh/Mihr-Šāhpur Mamikonean, bishop of Tarōn! *Girk' T'it'oc'* (Tiflis, 1901) [= *GT'*], p. 73.

³⁵ Tac. *Ann.*, II, lvi, «... favor [Armeniae] nationis inclinabat in Zenonem, Polemonis regis filium... Germanicus in urbem Artaxata [Artašat]... insigne regium capiti eius imposuit. Ceteri venerantes regem Artaxiam [Artašēs] consulatavere, quod illi vocabulum indiderant ex nomine urbis».

³⁶ For Trdat I's journey and its Magian overtones, the *locus classicus* remains, Pliny, *Natural History* (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1963), XXX, vi, 16—17, «Magus ad eum [Neronem] Tiridates venerat... navigare noluerat, quoniam expuere in maria aliisque mortalium necessitatibus violare naturam eam fas non putant. Magos secum adduxerat...», together with the scant additional information of Dio Cassius, LXIII, ii, 2—3. Although these passages have long been familiar to scholars, they were noted merely in passing by F. Cumont, *Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra*, 2 vols. (Brussels, 1896—1899), I, p. 105 n. 4, or F. Cumont and J. Bidez, *Les mages hellénisés* (Paris, 1938; repr. 1973), II, p. 298 n. 1, since Cumont was of the opinion that Armenian Mithraism differed radically from its Iranian prototype, see F. Cumont, *The Mysteries of Mithra*, T. J. McCormack tr. (New York, 1956), pp. 11, 16, an opinion partially shared by J. Unvala, *Observations on the Religion of the Parthians* (Bombay, 1925), pp. 22, 25—26, 32—33, etc. However, Widengren, *Mysteries of Mithra*, pp. 443—444, 454, opts for North-western Iran and Armenia as the homeland of the mysteries, see also T'. Avdalbegyan, «Mihr Hayoc' meř», *Hayagitakan hetazotut'yunner* (Erevan, 1969), pp. 13—79. One of the aspects of Trdat's journey which has caught the attention of scholars has been its possible influence on the Christian tale of the journey of the Magi, E. Herzfeld, *Archaeological History of Iran* (London, 1935), pp. 63—66; U. Monneret de Villard, *Le leggende orientale sui magi evangelistici* (Vatican, 1952); and G. Vezin, *L'Adoration et le cycle des mages* (Paris, 1950).

The acquaintance of the Armenian author Eznik Kořbac'i with Iranian religion, *Etc Ałandoc'* (Venice, 1926), has likewise been duly noted: R. C. Zaehner, *The Dawn and Twilight of Zoroastrianism* (New York, 1961), p. 188 and *Zurvan. A Zoroastrian Dilemma* (Oxford, 1955), M. Molé, *Culte, mythe et cosmologie dans l'Iran antique* (Paris, 1963), p. 128 n. 4; H. W. Bailey,

Zoroastrian Problems in the Ninth-Century Books (Oxford, 1943; repr. 1971), pp. 38–39, and considerable work has been done on Armenian paganism since the days of Ališan and Gelzer. Additional attention has been, and is being, given to folklore and to the epic tradition of the “songs of Gołt’n” preserved in early Armenian sources: G. Xalat’ean, *Armianskii ėpos v istorii Armenii Moiseia Khoreskogo* (Moscow, 1896); M. Abelean, *Der armenische Volksglaube* (Leipzig, 1899) [= *Volksglaube*]; M. Ananikian, *Armenian Mythology* (London, 1929); Avdalbegyan *Mihr* (First published in Vienna, 1929); Melik’-Ohanjanyan, *Agat’angelos*; etc. Vide infra n. 61 for the preservation of the oral tradition. The treatment of Armenia in G. Widengren, *Les Religions de l’Iran* (Paris, 1968) [= *Religions*], especially pp. 201–218 is considerably more ample than has been the norm heretofore. Nevertheless, even such distinguished scholars as E. Benveniste, *Vrtra et Vrtragna* (Paris, 1934) [= *Vrtra*], pp. 74–80, followed by J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *La Religion de l’Iran ancien* (Paris, 1962), p. 178, deny the importance of the Armenian evidence on the god Vərəθragna / Vahagn despite the recognized etymological link between them (I shall return to this question elsewhere). As a result of this partial neglect, a great deal remains to be done on early Armenian paganism in the light of its Iranian past. This is particularly important in view of the continuity of religious associations with such sites as Bagaran, Bagawan, Aštišat, and others, e. g. the explicit association of these sites with pagan rites in MX I, lxvi, pp. 201–202 [= MK I, p. 306/7]; I, lxxvii, p. 216 [= MK I, p. 330/1]; similarly, at a later date, MX III, lxvi, p. 354 [= MK II, p. 186/7]. Vide supra n. 33 et infra n. 40, for the baptism of Trdat the Great at Bagawan in Bagrewand, and the persistence of the tradition of a holy place at this site in the Christian period.

³⁷ The Armenian pantheon is familiar from references to the gods and their shrines in both Classical and Armenian sources. See, for instance:

a) Aa, xlviii–xlix, liii, lix, lxxviii, cxxvii and especially dclxxvii–dccc, dcccix, p. 30–31, 38, 73, 403–423 [= CHAMA I, pp. 125–127, 128–129, 134–135, 403–429]; MX I, vi, xx, xxxi; II, viii, xii, xiv, xlviii–xlix, liii, lxxvii, lxxxvi; iii, xvii, pp. 24, 63–64, 85–86; 117, 123–124, 127–128, 175–177, 183, 216, 232–233, 276 [= MK I, pp. 30/1–32/33, 94/5, 124/5–126/7, 162/3–164/5, 172/3–174/5, 180/1–182/3, 260. 1–264/5, 276/7, 330/1 358/9–362/3; II, 36/7, etc.]; P’B, III, iii, xiv; V, xxv, pp. 11–12, 58, 327 [= CHAMA I, pp. 211, 225, 291]; Eñšē, pp. 32, 35, 165, 185 [= CHAMA II, pp. 193, 195, 237, 244]; ŁP’, II, xx, xxiv, pp. 39–40 [= CHAMA II, pp. 278–279, 282], et. al.

b) The Greek inscriptions found at Armavir, one of which seems to contain the name of Mithra, A. I. Boltunova, «Grecheskie nadpisi Ar-

mavira», *Izvestiia Armianskogo Filiala Ak. Nauk SSSR* (Erevan, 1942/1–2), pp. 35–37; H. Manandyan, *Armavir hunaren arjanagrut’yunnera nor lusabanut’yamb* (Erevan, 1946 in arm. and rus.), pp. 18–22 and fig. 4; K. Trever, *Ocherki po istorii kul’tury drevnei Armenii* (Erevan, 1953) [= *Ocherki*], pp. 133–137 and fig. 28; and at Ga’ni, where the Armenian king Trdat/Tiridates appears to be identified with the Sun-god, *Ibid.*, pp. 174–211 and fig. 33, also K. Trever, *Nadpisi postroenii armianskoj kreposti Garni* (Leningrad, 1949).

c) Strabo, *The Geography*, H. L. Jones tr. (Cambridge, Mass.—London, 1944) XI, xii, 10 = xiv, 12, and particularly, XI, xiv, 16, for the cult of Anahit in Akilisenē/Ekeleac’.

The names of the gods are often given in Greek form especially by Movsēs Xorenac’, but these forms are merely the syncretic equivalents of the Iranian originals, as is obvious from the double forms (Iranian—Greek) given by Aa, and particularly in the parallel sections of Ag, xxii, xxviii, lvii, cxxviii, cxxxiii, cxxxiii, cxl, as well as in P’B, III, xiv, p. 58 [= CHAMA I, 224], who gives the equivalence of Herakles and Vahagn, «...հործանեաց զբազինս մեհենիցն Հերակլոսս սպս ինքն վաճապիտ, ...». Even MX speaks alternately of Apollo and Artemis, (II, xii, pp. 122–123 = MK I pp. 172/3–174/5) and the Sun and Moon (MX II, viii, p. 117 = MK I, pp. 162/3–164/5). Some of these equivalents are questionable, e. g. Mihr = ? Hephaistos, Tir = ? Apollo = ? Hermes, also the variants of the name Aramazd/Ormizd (Aa, dclxxviii vs dclxxxvi), cf. G. Garitte, *Documents pour l’étude du livre d’Agathange* (Vatican, 1946) [= *Agathange*], pp. 195, 199, 203–204, 210, 214, and S. Sargsyan, *Hellenistakan Darašrjani Hayastana ew Movsēs Xorenac’in* (Erevan, 1966), p. 62, but these problems are not germane to the present study.

There is no doubt that some of the gods, especially the Syrian Baršaminay = Baal-Šamin whose shrine was at T’ordan (Aa, dclxxxiv, see Garitte, *Agathange*, pp. 230–231), etc. were of Semitic origin, but the evidence is by no means so clear in the case of the goddess Nanē/Nanai = Athena at T’il (Aa, dclxxxvi), since despite her Semitic antecedents she was known to the Parthians from ancient times, see D’iakonov, *Orbeli Sbornik*, p. 329 # 14 and Frye, *Persia*, pp. 191–192. She may well have reached Armenia by way of the Parthians rather than directly through Mesopotamia. This is all the more likely that Aa, dclxxxvi, p. 410 [= CHAMA I, p. 168] speaks of her as the daughter of Ahuramazda.

For general studies of Armenian religion, see H. Gelzer, «Zur armenischen Götterlehre», *Berichte der Könige, Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* (1896), pp. 99–148; Abelean, *Volksglaube*; Ananikian, *Mythology*; G. Wikan-

der, *Feuerpriester in Kleinasien und Iran* (Lund, 1946); A. Perikhanian, *Khramovye ob'edineniia Maloi Azii i Armenii* (Moscow, 1959); A. Carrière, *Les Huits sanctuaires de l'Arménie payenne* (Paris, 1899); Widengren, *Religions*, pp. 201—225; and the excellent Introduction and notes to R. Thomson's translation of "Agat'angelos" now in press, which he was kind enough to make available to me for this paper. On specific deities, see, e. g. M.-L. Chaumont, «Le culte de la déesse Anahita dans la religion de l'Iran et de l'Arménie», *Journal Asiatique*, CCLIII (1965), pp. 165—181; K. V. Melik'-P'asvayan, *Anahit Dic'uhu paštamunk'a* (Erevan, 1963); Benveniste, *Vrtra* (although I shall discuss elsewhere the validity of his conclusions, pp. 74—80, separating the Iranian Vərəθragna from the Armenian Vahagn), G. Dumézil, "Vahagn", *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CXVII (1938), pp. 152—170, as well as his «A propos de 'Vərəθragna', *Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, I (1949), pp. 223—226, and *Heur et malheur du guerrier* (Paris, 1969), pp. 111—112, 115—121; Abelyan, *Litterature*, p. 33; and Avdal-begyan, *Mihr*; etc.

³⁸ The close connexion of the two traditions was observed by Strabo, *Geography*, XI, xiii, 9, and particularly, XI, xiv, 16, "Ἀπαντα μὲν οὖν τὰ τῶν Περσῶν ἱερὰ καὶ Μηδοὶ καὶ Ἀρμένιοι τετιμῆ-
κασιν...", although a mistaken etymology led him to link the shrines which he calls Ἰάσωνα (XI, iv, 8; xiii, 10; xiv, 12) with Jason's expedition rather than with Iranian places of sacrifice and worship (> Av yaze, pāz. Phl. yaštan, Arm. yazem), Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 197—198; Widengren, *Religions*, p. 152.

The raising of horses in Armenia for sacrifices to the sun and as part of the tribute sent to Persia for the same rites, especially for the Mithrakina, was observed by Xenophon, *The Anabasis*, C, L. Brown tr. (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1950), IV, v, 34—36, and *The Cyropaedia*, W. Miller tr. (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1960), VIII, iii, 11—12. See Herodotus, *Histories*, A. D. Godley tr. (Cambridge, Mass. — London, 1960), VII, 113, "... ἐς αὐτὸν τὸν Στρυμόνα· ἐς τὸν Μάγοι ἐκαλλιεργόντες ἵππους λευκοὺς", and Tac., *Ann*, VI, xxxiv, li, «Sacrificantibus, cum hic [Vitellius] more Romano suovetaurilia daret, ille [Tiridates] equum placando amni adornasset, ...», for the sacrifice of horses to rivers; but sacrifices to the Sun were more common, Justin, *Epitoma*, I, x, 5, «Nam et solem Parsae unum deum esse credunt et equos eidem deo sacratos fuerunt». The Nisaeen horses noted by Herodotus, *Histories*, I, 189; VII, 40, were also recorded by Strabo, *Geography*, XI, xiv, 9, and Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*, I, xxxi, as reserved for sacrifices, cf. Widengren, *Religions*, pp. 151—152, 211—212. The splendid silver bowls from Armazi decorated with an incised gilt relief showing a horse raising his

right forefoot in obeisance *Mtsxeta*, pp. 63—64, figs., 27—28, and pls. lvi—lvii; also R. Ramišvili et al «Arkheologicheskie izyskaniia v Aragvskom uschel'e», *Polevye arkheologicheskie issledovaniia v 1974 godu* (Tbilisi, 1974), p. 73 and pl. LII, 2. Cows seem likewise to have been sacrificed to Anahita, Plutarch, "Lucullus", xxiv; cf. Widengren, *Religions*, pp. 211—212, 258.

The "barsmunk" or "twigs" (Ačaryan, *Etymology*, 2nd ed., I, pp. 429—430), associated with the rites of Anahit in Aa, xlix, p. 30 [= CHAMA I, p. 126], cf. Eznik, p. 127, 132, 142—143, 150—151, are more than likely connected with the Iranian "barsman" or "barsom", as has been suggested by Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, p. 119, Wikander, *Feuerpriester*, p. 93, cf. Widengren, *Religions*, p. 46, although Thomson is rather doubtful in his forthcoming commentary and notes on Aa, xlix. Finally, see also Abelyan, *Volksglaube*, pp. 63 sqq., and G. Dumezil, «Les Fleurs Haurot — Maurot et les anges Haurvatât-Amêrêtat», *REArm*, VI/2 (1926), pp. 43—69. The question of ancestor worship will be considered below, vide infra n. 41.

³⁹ Aa, cxxvi—cxxvii, pp. 73 [= CHAMA I, pp. 134—135], «Տրդատ արքայ Հայոց մեծաց առ մեծամեծս եւ առ իշխանս եւ առ նախարարս եւ առ զործակալս եւ առ պլ մարդիկդ, որ ընդ իմով իշխանութեամբք էք, ... Ողջոյն հետեալ եւ շինութիւն դիցն օգնականութեամբ, լիութիւն պարարտութեան յարոյն Արամազդայ, խնամակալութիւն յԱնահիտ տիկնջէ, եւ քաջութիւն հասցէ ձեզ ի քաջէն վահագնէ ամենայն Հայոց աշխարհիս...»:

⁴⁰ Vide supra n. 17 for the activities of Kartir, KKZ = KNR, and n. 18 for the fires founded by Šāhpuhr I in SKZ, iv, 5; cf. J. de Menasce, «La conquête de l'iranisme et la récupération des mages hellénisés», *Annuaire de l'école des hautes études* (Paris, 1956).

The reforms of Artasir, MX II, lxxvii, p. 216 [= MK I, pp. 330/1—332/3] are particularly interesting in this connexion. At an earlier point, Movsēs Xorenac'i had said that the statues of the gods had been brought from Greece and set up in Armenia, MX II, xii, p. 123 [= MK I, 174/5], II, xiv, pp. 127—128 [= MK I, p. 180/1], the reference to Asia Minor, II, xii, p. 122 [= MK I, 173/4] does not contradict the ultimate Hellenic origin of the statues. Consequently, the smashing of the statues at the order of the Armenian king, and the maintenance of the eternal fire alone cf. Isidore of Charax, *The Parthian Stations*, W. H. Schoff, ed. and tr., Philadelphia, 9, 4, vi, xi) seem to indicate a shift back from the Hellenic iconic to the Iranian aniconic tradition; see, Herodotus, *Histories*, I, 131, "Πέρσας δὲ οἶδα νόμοι τοιοῦτοι χρεωμένους, ἀγάλματα μὲν καὶ ἱηοὺς καὶ βωμοὺς οὐκ ἐν νόμῳ ποιευμένους ἰδρῦσθαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖσι ποιεῦσι ἐπιφέρουσι ὥς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, οὐκ ἀνφρωποφρέας ἐνόμισαν τοὺς θεοὺς κατὰ περ οἱ Ἕλληνες εἶναι..." and M. Boyce, "Iconoclasm

among the Zoroastrians", *Studies for Merton Smith at Sixty*, J. Neusner ed., Pt. IV (Leiden, 1975), pp. 93—111.

The strength of the Iranian religious tradition is particularly noticeable in the continuity of sacred sites despite the Christianization of Armenia, e. g. Bagawan where a) Tigran erected an altar on the tomb of his brother, the high-priest Mažan, MX II, lxvi, pp. 201—202 [= MK I, p. 306/7], b) Artasir maintained an eternal fire, MX II, lxvii, p. 316 [= MK I, p. 330/1], c) the heavenly light appeared at the baptism of Trdat the Great by St. Gregory, MX III, lxvi, p. 354 [= MK II, p. 186/7]; cf. Aa, dcccxvii—dcccxviii, p. 426 [= CHAMA I, p. 176].

⁴¹ The classic statement on Armenian ancestor worship is found in Aa, xxii, pp. 18—19 [= CHAMA I, p. 117]. Cf N. Adontz's unlikely hypothesis in «Grégoire l'Illuminateur et Anak le Parthe», REArm, VIII (1928), p. 242. References to the royal burial places are found in P'B, III, xi, p. 44 [= CHAMA I, p. 221]; IV, xxiv, pp. 219—220 [= CHAMA I, p. 261], MX II, lxvii, p. 316 [= I, p. 330/1] and the burial place of the Armenian Arsacids can still be seen at Aic in the Armenian SSR. The worship due from the son to the father is described in the relations between Ormizd and Zrwan in Ehišē, p. 25 [= CHAMA II, p. 190] and Eznik, II, v, pp. 142—144. See A. Perikhanian's discussion of the links, such as "shared worship" and "the cult of the souls of ancestors on the father's side" which linked agnatic groups, in the chapter on "Iranian Society and Law in the Parthian and Sasanian Periods", *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol. III (in press), which she was kind enough to allow me to see.

⁴² The literature on Armeno-Iranian institutions is too vast by now to permit detailing here. Despite a tendency to seek occasionally unwarranted western parallels for Armenian institutions, see: Adontz, *Armenia*, passim and "Bibliographical Note", p. 262*, also Appendix III, "Armenian Administrative Documents", for the *Throne-list* or *Gahnamak*, the *Military-list*, and the *Ps. Gahnamak*, pp. 67*—72*; and 213—214, 218, 227—233; as well as Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 229 sq., on the authenticity of these documents; H. Manandean, *Feodalizmā hin Hayastanum: Aršakunineri ew marzpanut'yan šrjan* (Erevan, 1934), *Ditołut'yunner hin Hayastani šinakanneri drut'yan masin marzpetut'yan šrjanum* (Erevan, 1925), *Zametki o feodi i feodal'nom voiske Parfi i Arshakidskoj Armenii* (Tbilisi, 1932); R. Kherumian, «Esquisse d'une féodalité oubliée», *Vostan*, I (1948—1949); A. G. Sukiasian, *Obshchestvenno-politichiskii stroi i pravo Armenii v epokhu rannego feodalizma* (Erevan, 1963). Most particularly see Toumanoff's illuminating distinction between "dynasticism" and "feudalism" in mediaeval Armenia, *Studies*, pp. 34—40, 110 sqq. et passim.

Armenian sources such as Aa, P'B, LP', MX, Ehišē, et al, are so much more detailed on Iranian hierarchical parallels than the *topos* for the structure of Iranian society, Theophylakt Simokatta, *Historiae*, C. de Boor ed. (Leipzig, 1887), III, viii, that even Christensen, *Iran*, pp. 77 sq. admits their usefulness, although he makes less use of them than many of his colleagues. Because of this usefulness, a number of scholars: N. Adontz, «L'Aspect iranien du servage», *Recueil de la Société Jean Bodin*, II (1937). M.-L. Chaumont, «L'ordre des préséances à la cour des Arsacides d'Arménie», *JA*, CCLIV (1966) [= *Préséances*]; G. Widengren, «Recherches sur le féodalisme iranien», *Orientalia Suecana*, V (1956), and *Der Feudalismus im alten Iran* (Cologne, 1969), etc., have used Armenian examples constantly to explain Iranian institutions and practices.

⁴³ The classic statement that Armenia was well and at peace when each man held his proper station is found in P'B IV, ii, p. 103 [= CHAMA I, p. 236] «Եւ նորոգեցաւ զուարթեցաւ անբռնելի թագաւորութեանն Հայաստան երկրին որպէս եւ զառաջինն. մեծամեծքն յիրաքանչիւր գահու, եւ զործակալքն յիրաքանչիւր չափու»։ Similarly MX I, ix, p. 30 [= MK I, p. 40/1]; II, iii, p. 104 [= MK I, pp. 142/3—144/5], who sets out the proper system more specifically in the case of the mythical Vałaršak, MX II, viii, pp. 117—118 [= MK I, p. 164/5]; also MX II, lxxvii, p. 216 [= MK I, p. 330/1]. The social classes present at any given event are always carefully detailed in Aa, cxxvii, p. 73 [= CHAMA I, p. 134, vide supra n. 39 for the text], and Aa, cxxxi, p. 75 [= CHAMA I, p. 135]; P'B, III, xxi, pp. 83—84 [= CHAMA I, p. 231]; or in the case of the participants in an ecclesiastical council, e. g. GT', p. 72, «Ուխտ միաբանութեան Հայոց աշխարհիս ի ձեռն ներսէսի Հայոց Կաթողիկոսի, եւ Մերչապհայ Մամիկոնից եպիսկոպոսի: եւ Պետրոսի Սիննայց եպիսկոպոսի: եւ այլոց աթողականաց, եւ տանուտերանց: եւ ազատաց: եւ համարէն ժողովրդականաց»։

The order of precedence of the Armenian nobles can be seen in such documents as the *Gahnamak*, Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 191—195 sqq. and Appendix III, pp. 67*—72*. Despite the late and dubious quality of these lists (Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 229—231), the importance of the hierarchical structure is evident from the presumable disturbance created by their alteration, even at the very end of the Armenian Arsacid period, reported by MX III, li, pp. 322—323 [= MK II, p. 128/9]. It is interesting to observe that even an Armenian document such as the *Gahnamak* admits that this order had been brought from Persia, "Preface", Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 191, 67*.

In Iran, the structure of society divided into three and subsequently four classes was based

on the sacred Scriptures themselves: *Yasna*, 19.17; 11.6; *Yašt*, 13.89; *Videvdāt*, 5.28; 13.46; 14.10. etc. It is found in the Hājjiābād inscription of Šāhpuhr I, where the king shoots before the "šaθridāran/χšaθridārīn u vishpuhrān u vazurkān u āzātān", H. S. Nyberg, "Hājjiābād Inskriften", *Øst og Vest* (Copenhagen, 1945). The Letter of Tansar repeats the scriptural authority and necessity of the system of estates, pp. 37—39, "Know that according to our religion men are divided into four estates. This is set down in many places in the holy books and established beyond controversy and interpretation, contradiction and speculation. They are known as the four estates, and at their head is the king. The first is that of the clergy... The second estate is that of the military, ... the third estate is that of the scribes, ... the fourth estate is known as that of the artisans, and comprises the tillers of land... It is through these four estates that humanity will prosper as long as it endures", cf. p. 43, "The King of kings has established new customs and new ways; but family and rank are corner-piers and struts and foundations and pillars. When the foundation perishes the house decays, is ruined and collapses". The same sentiments are echoed in P'B, IV, ii and MX I, ix. As for the structure, it permeates Iranian literature and the Arab texts derived from it: the *Kārnāmak-i Artakshīr Pāpakān*, E. R. Antia tr. (Bombay, 1900) [= *Kārnāmag*], XV, viii, p. 37 = *The Kārnāmē i Artakshīr i Pāpakān*, D. D. Sanjana tr. (Bombay, 1896), X, vi, p. 43; «Le 'Testament d'Ardašīr ibn Bābak'», Grignaschi, *Litterature* [= *Testament*], pp. 74—75, 78; «L'Āyin d'Ardašīr», *Ibid.*, [= *Āyin*], pp. 112, 114—115; «Le Kārnāmağ d'Anušīrwān», *Ibid.*, [= *Anušīrwān*], Episodes iv, vii—viii, xi—xii, pp. 20—22, 25—26; «Le livre de la couronne», *Ibid.*, [= *Couronne*], p. 129; E. Browne, "Some Accounts of the Arabic Work Entitled 'Nihāyatu'l-irab fi akhbārī'l-Furs wa'l-'Arab'...", *JRAS* (1900) *Nihāyat*, pp. 219—220; Tabari, *Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sassaniden*, Th. Nöldeke tr. (Leipzig, 1879; repr. Gratz, 1973) [= Nöldeke, *Tabari*], p. 437; Bel'ami, *Chronique de... Tabari traduite sur la version persane d'Abou-'Ali Mohammed Bel'ami*, H. Zotenberg, tr. (Paris, 1958 repr.). I, xxxvii—xxxix, pp. 102—103; lxix, p. 283; II, xi, p. 69, etc.; Mas'ūdī, *Les Prairies d'or*, Ch. Pellat tr. (Paris, 1971), I, xxiv (¶ 578, 581—582, 662), pp. 217—219, 247; al-Tha'alibī, *Histoire des rois des perses*, H. Zotenberg tr. (Paris, 1900; repr. Tehran, 1963), pp. 12, 15, etc. It is also found throughout the *Šāhnāma*, J. Mohl, *Le Livre des rois*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1876) [= *Šāhnāma*].

On this subject, the following should also be consulted among others: Dumézil, *Idéologie*; as well as his numerous other works; E. Benveniste, «Les Classes sociales dans la tradition

avestique", *JA*, CCXXI (1932) [= *Classes*], pp. 117—134; Chaumont, *Préséances*; Christensen, *Iran*, pp. 97 sqq; Wikander, *Feuerpriester*, pp. 198 sqq. and «Sur le fond commun indo-iranien des épopées de la Perse et de l'Inde», *La Nouvelle Clio*, II (1950), pp. 316, 321—327; Molé, *Culte*, pp. 453—469; Perikhanian, *CHI*; Widengren, *Recherches*, et al.

44 The literature on the Armenian great hereditary offices is too extensive to give more than a sampling here. The general conclusions can be subsumed in the statement of Widengren, *Recherches*, p. 100, «Les faits arméniens en effet relèvent de conditions qui sont entièrement conformes aux données iraniennes». See also Manandyan, *Feudalism*. Adontz, *Armenia*; Toumanoff, *Studies*; Benveniste, *Titres*, etc. On the main offices:

a) *The Coronant* — *Aspet*: According to Aa dccxcv, p. 414 = Ag, cxxxv, p. 304 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 170], the senior dignity after the *Bdešys* and the *Mardpet*, belonged to the royal Coronant, whose office was often linked to that of the *Aspet* or Commander of the cavalry, see Adontz, *Armenia*, Appendix III, pp. 72*—76*, for other versions of "Agat'angelos". This dignity was normally hereditary in the Bagratid house if we are to believe their dynastic historian, MX I, xxii, p. 69 [= *MK* I, p. 100/1], «...դթագադիր ազգդ Բագրատունեաց լիկէլ:»; MX II, iii, pp. 104—105 [= *MK* I, p. 144/5], where king Valaršak is said to have appointed the Jew Šambat — Bagarat; MX II, vii, p. 110 [= *MK* I, p. 152/3], where the regalia proper to this office is given; MX II, xiv, p. 128 [= *MK* I, p. 182/3]; MX II, xxiv, pp. 139—141 [= *MK* I, pp. 200/1—202/3]; MX II, xxxvii, p. 162 [= *MK* I, pp. 238/9—240/1], where the coronation of the last Erwandid king is predictably ill-fated since the hereditary coronant is not present at the ceremony; MX III, xxxvii, p. 303—305 [= *MK* II, pp. 86/7—90/1], where the *tagadir* Smbat Bagratuni deliberately parodies his function by "crowning" Meružan Arcruni with red hot iron in punishment for his treason; MX III, xlvi, p. 315 [= *MK* II, p. 112/3], etc. These numerous references are clear evidence of MX's interest in the Bagratuni house, whose historian he was. Conversely, it is interesting to observe the corresponding negligence of the Mamikonean house historians, such as P'B, V, xliv, p. 383 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 305], who mentions the Bagratid's hereditary office only once, and even reduces the Bagratuni to mere companions in arms «Իրգազակեցի» of the Mamikonean, P'B, III, vii, p. 27 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 216]; LP', II, xxxvi, lxviii, pp. 67, 121 [= *CHAMA* II, pp. 295, 328], etc.; also the *Primary History*, Sebēos, p. 9; and the derogatory comment of Elisē concerning the Bagratids, p. 74 [= *CHAMA* II, p. 207].

On the Iranian side, the rôle of the coronant

is likewise attested by both Tac. *Ann.*, V, xlii, who attributes it to the Sürēn, and by Th. Sim. III, viii, who links it with the family of the 'Αγριαβίδης = 'Αγριαβίδης, but separates it from the command of the cavalry, which he lists as a separate office. See Christensen, *Iran*, p. 107; Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 112 n. 176, 132, 202, 313, 325 n. 89, 326, 342, etc. The disappearance of the coronant in the *Letter of Tansar*, pp. 61—62, may be due to the centralizing policy of the later Sasanians, as well as to Tansar's well known clerical bias which naturally leads him to exalt the rôle of the chief *mobadh* at the expense of the secular dignitaries, cf. M. Boyce, *Ibid.*, p. 62 n. 1; "Middle Persian Literature", *Handbuch der Orientalistik*, I, iv/2, p. 61; and Grignaschi, *Littérature*, p. 9.

b) *The Sparapet*: Best known of the great hereditary offices, the *sparapet* or Grand Marshall of the realm (< Pehl. *spāhpat* < OP *spādā-paitis*, Ačaryan, *Etymology*, VI, pp. 399—400; Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, p. 240; Toumanoff — who prefers the term "High Constable" — *Studies*, p. 97 n. 144; Frye, *Minorsky*, p. 7) first appears in Armenian historiography in Aa, dcccxcv, p. 415 = Ag, cxxxv, p. 304 [= CHAMA I, p. 170]. Ag renders the title as, "ἀρχὸν στρατοπέδαρχης στρατηλατικῆς ἐξουσίας τῆς Ἀρμενίας χώρας...", although the term *στράτηγος* is the equivalent in Biblical passages, e. g. I Ezr. 314; I Macc. 2.66; 4.47; II Macc. 3.5; 4.4; 8.8 8.9; III Kgs. 2.21; 2.31; etc., whereas MX III, lxv, p. 325 [= MK I, p. 184/5] uses the alternate form *սարապետ* = *στρατηλάτης*.

Although both Aa, dcccix, p. 451 [= CHAMA I, p. 184], and Ag, clix, p. 330 mention only the given name of the Armenian *sparapet*, «Արաւազ, որ սպարապետն էր ամենայն զորացն Հայոց Մեծայն», this office seems normally to have been hereditary in the Mamikonean house under the Christian Arsacids as evidenced in the later versions of the Gregorian Cycle: Vg, cxxiv Garitte, *Agathange*, p. 83, "Ἀρτάβα <σ>δος, ὁ τῶν Μαμακουνιανῶν γενεάρχης καὶ ἀσπαρπέτης πάσης Ἀρμενίας, ...", and Va, cxii, *Idem.*, «directio autem omnium copiarum erat in potestate Artavasdi (r'tw'sdus) principis... mqwnyn et asparapetae (šb'r'b'ts), sub cuius potestate tota Armenia erat;...», also *Ibid.*, pp. 72—73, 203, 306. The Bagratid historian MX II, lxxxii, p. 224; lxxxv, p. 231 [= MK I, pp. 344/5, 356/7] attempts to substitute the surname Mandakuni for the *sparapet* Artavazd of the Gregorian Cycle, but even he is forced to admit that the office of *sparapet* belonged to the Mamikonean house, MX III, lxv, p. 352 [= MK II, p. 184/5].

The Mamikonean historians, P'awstos Buzand and Łazar P'arpec'i, are able to record the name of the Mamikonean *sparapet* in every

generation following the Artavazd of Aa: P'B, III, iv, p. 15 [= CHAMA I, p. 212], Vač'ē under Xosrov Kotak; P'B, III, xi—pp. 41, 43—44 [= CHAMA I, pp. 220—221], Vač'ē's son Artavazd likewise under king Xosrov; P'B, IV, ii, pp. 102—103 [= CHAMA I, pp. 231—232], Vasak at the very beginning of the reign of Aršak II; P'B, V, i, pp. 277—278 [= CHAMA I, p. 278], Mušet at the enthronization of Pap; P'B, V, xxxvii, pp. 358—359 [= CHAMA I, p. 299], Manuēl, despite the grant of the *sparapetut'iwn* to Bat Sahaḥuni by king Varazdat; P'B V, xlv, p. 384 [= CHAMA I, p. 305], Artašir son of Manuēl without any consultation with the king Aršak III, etc. Similarly, ŁP' I, xxxviii, p. 37 [= CHAMA II, p. 278] speaks of the Mamikonean *sparapet* Hamazasp; and particularly of his son, the hero par excellence, Vardan Mamikonean, ŁP', II, xxiv, xxviii, xxx, pp. 45, 55, 58 sq. [= CHAMA II, pp. 282, 283, 290], as well as of Vardan's nephew Vahan, the future marzban, ŁP', III, lxviii, p. 121 [= CHAMA II, p. 328], etc. I am indebted for this list and for part of the research to the MA Thesis on "The Armenian Sparapetut'iwn" presented by my student, Mr. Robert Bedrosian. Whenever the Mamikonean line is broken by substitutions, as in the case of Aršavir Kamsarakan and Andovk Siwni serving for the child Artavazd Mamikonean, P'B, III, xi, p. 41 [= CHAMA I, pp. 220—221], the royal appointee Bat Sahaḥuni, P'B V, xxxvii, p. 358 [= CHAMA I, p. 299] or Dara Siwni, MX III, xlvi, p. 315 [= MK II, p. 112/3], we are invariably faced with a crisis — a minority, an illegal and soon to be overthrown royal appointment, or a chaotic situation. On the Armenian *sparapetut'iwn*, see particularly Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 97 n. 144, 112 n. 176, 132, 141 n. 253, 201 n. 228, 209, 210—211 n. 238, 325—326, etc., and Widengren, *Recherches*, pp. 101 sqq., as well as the earlier studies of Adontz, *Armenia* and Manandyan, *Feudalism*.

The office of *Ērān-spāhpat* is known from such Pahlavi sources as the *Kārnāmag of Ardašir*, Sanjana ed. X, vii, p. 43 = Antiā ed., XV, ix, p. 37; the *Letter of Tansar*, p. 61; *Couronne*, p. 131 and n. 5; Nöldeke, *Tabari*, pp. 5 and nn. 1, 3; Th. Sim., III, viii, et al. See Christensen, *Iran*, pp. 104 n. 1, 107, 109, 130—131; Widengren, *Recherches*, pp. 101—108, etc.

c) The "Second after the King": Vide supra n. 28 for a discussion of this office as well as its archaization into legendary history by MX I, xiii, p. 44 [= MK I, p. 64/5], and the grant of this title by king "Artašēs", MX II, xlvii, p. 174 [= MK I, p. 258/9].

d) A number of other hereditary offices are known in the Armenian tradition. The most familiar list of these is found in MX II, vi—viii, also xi, xv, pp. 109—118, 121, 129—130 [= MK I, pp. 152/3—166/7, 170/1, 190/1—192/3], etc. See Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 369—370; Toumanoff,

Studies, pp. 204—205, 208, 220, 221, 222; as well as 154—163, A. Pagliaro, «Reflessi di etimologie iraniche nella tradizione storiografica greca», *Rendiconti dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Classe di scienze morali, storiche e filologiche*, Serie VIII, vol. 9, pp. 133—146 and G. Bolognesi, «La tradizione culturale armena nelle sue relazioni col mondo persiano e col mondo greco-romano», *La Persia e il mondo Greco-Romano* (Rome, 1966), p. 576, on the question of the problematic *bdešxs*. See the next note for the patriarchal office.

⁴⁵ The concept of the hereditary transmission of the kingship, as characteristic of Arsacid Armenia as it was of the Sasanian realm, was of course entirely foreign to the Roman empire where, even in the Byzantine period, the popular mandate to the new ruler, symbolized by acclamations and the raising on a shield, was an indispensable part of the coronation ceremony. This dichotomy which serves as a watershed between the Classical and Oriental concepts of the transmission of power within the State can simultaneously serve as another indication that, in this crucial domain as well, Armenia was on the Iranian side.

The succession from father to son of the bishops in a given see was not particularly shocking in the early Christian period with which we are concerned, since clerical celibacy was by no means established as yet. What is unusual in the Armenian practice is the concept of the patriarchate as a *family office* on a par with the kingship in the Arsacid house or the *sparapetut'iwn* in that of the Mamikonean. Not only was St. Gregory followed by both of his sons, A'istakēs and Vrt'anēs, P'B, III, iii, p. 11 [= CHAMA I, p. 211] and by his grandson Yusik, P'B, III, xii, pp. 46—50 [= CHAMA I, p. 221—222], but the dignity could pass out of his family only if there were no fitting member to receive it: P'B, III, xiii, p. 55 [= CHAMA I, p. 224]; III, xvii, p. 70 [= CHAMA I, p. 228]; MX III, xvi, p. 275 [= MK II, p. 34/5]; III, xxxix, p. 306 [= MK II, p. 94/5]. Even though against their will, the sons of Yusik were forced into holy orders, P'B, III, xv, pp. 67—68 [= CHAMA I, p. 227]; and the recreation of normalcy with the accession of Aršak II was sealed with the return of the patriarchate to St. Gregory's descendent, St. Nersēs I, P'B IV, iii, pp. 104—110 [= CHAMA I, pp. 226—228]. The same pattern is finally followed by the enthronization of the last Gregorid, St. Sahak I, without awaiting the permission of the Persian king, MX III, xlix, pp. 320—321 [= MK II, p. 123/4], and his death is followed by a long elegy bewailing the woes of Armenia deprived of its rightful leaders, on which Movsēs Xorenac'i's *History* closes, MX III, xlx—l, lxv, lxvii—lxviii, pp. 320—321, 350—351, 355—366 [= MK II, pp. 122/2—124/5, 180/1,

188/9—206/7]. See. G. Garitte, *La Narratio de rebus Armeniae* (Louvain, 1952), pp. 57—62, 415—419; Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 281—282; Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 138—139, etc.

It is interesting to note in this connexion that MX II, vii, p. 116 [= MK I, p. 162/3] treats the pagan religious function as a hereditary office belonging to the family of the Vahnuni, this might be a reminiscence of the position of the Magians in Iran, Molé, *Culte*, pp. 78—80.

⁴⁶ The presence of an advisory and occasionally independent council in both Armenia and Iran is constantly attested by the sources as a normal institution.

In Armenia the council meets "as was the custom" at the beginning of a reign, P'B, III, xiii, p. 45 [= CHAMA I, p. 221]; MX I, xxvi, p. 75 [= MK I, p. 108/9]. Such a council may be held to choose a patriarch, P'B, IV, iii, pp. 104—105 [= CHAMA I, p. 236]; to seek a new king, P'B v, i. p. 277 [= CHAMA I, p. 278]; V, xlv, p. 384 [= CHAMA I, p. 305]; MX III, iv, x, pp. 260, 268 [= MK II, pp. 8/9—10/I, 22/23]; to advise the king, P'B III, xx, p. 79 [= CHAMA I, p. 230]; it can meet in his absence, P'B III, xxi; V, xxxiii, pp. 83—84, 329 [= CHAMA I, pp. 231, 296—297], MX II, lxxvi; III, xlviii, pp. 214, 317—318 [= MK I, p. 328/9; II, pp. 116/1—118/9]; or finally, to oppose him, P'B IV, li, pp. 244—247 [= CHAMA I, pp. 267—268]. See also P'B III, xiv; IV, xlv; V, xxxiv, etc., pp. 59, 238, 350—351 [= CHAMA I, pp. 225, 265, 297]; LP^c I, vi, ix, xi, xiii, xvii, and especially xxiii, xxvii—xxviii, pp. 8, 12, 16, 19, 37, 44—45, 49—50 [= CHAMA II, pp. 262, 264, 266—268, 277, 281—282, 284—285].

The Iranian council is recorded from presumably Median times—MX I, xxvi, p. 75 [= MK I, p. 108/9] onward, P'B IV, xx, pp. 204—210 [= CHAMA I, p. 257]. For the authority of the Parthian council vis-à-vis the king, see Strabo, *Geography*, XI, ix 3, and Justin, *Epitoma*, XLII, iv, 2; XLII, iv, 1. The survival of the custom under the Sasanians is recorded in Aa, xxiv, p. 19 [= CHAMA I, p. 118] = Ag, xii, p. 181; P'B III, xxi, p. 87 [= CHAMA I, p. 232; the *Letter of Tansar*, pp. 61—63; the *Testament*, pp. 78, 80, 82, etc., though it seems less institutionalized and powerful than before, very likely as a result of the centralizing efforts of the Sasanian crown. Vide infra n. 78.

⁴⁷ The necessity to obliterate a clan to the last individual in order to break its power and recuperate its property is reflected in the endless stories of the sole saved infant which permeate early Armenian literature: a) St. Gregory the Illuminator and Trdat the Great, Aa, xxxiv, xxxvi, pp. 23—24 [= CHAMA I, p. 121]; b) the total extirpation of the Manawazean, Orduni and Bznuni houses, P'B III, iv, pp. 14—16 [= CHAMA I, p. 212]

= MX III, ii, p. 258 [= MK II, p. 4/5]; c) Spandarāt Kamsarakān, P'B IV, xix, pp. 199—200 [= CHAMA I, p. 256] = MX III, xxxi, p. 295 [= MK II, p. 70/1]; d) Perozamat from the house of the Karen Pahlaw ancestors of the Kamsarakans, MX II, lxxiii, lxxxvii, pp. 209—210, 235 [= MK I, pp. 320/1—322/3, 362/3]; e) the last Mandakuni heiress carried off and married by Tačāt of the Asoč' house to whom she — as the only survivor of her house — could pass, the rights to her family property under Sasanian law, as was done by Sahakanoyš daughter of St. Sahak I, the last of the Gregorids, for her husband Hamazasp Mamikonean, MX II, lxxviii, p. 217 [= MK I, p. 322/3]; f) the two Slkuni survivors in C'op'k', MX II, lxxxiv, pp. 227—229 [= MK I, pp. 350/1—354/5]; g) the survival of the infant nephew of Zōray Rštuni, MX III, xv, p. 274 [= MK II, pp. 32/3—34/5], etc. Vide infra n. 61 for the tale of Artasēs son of Sanatruk and for the folklore aspects of these tales whose practical application must, however, also be taken into consideration.

48 On the common property of the agnatic or family group, see A. Perikhanian, "Agnaticheskie gruppy v drevnem Irane", *Vestnik drevnei istorii*, (1968/3), her forthcoming chapter in the *Cambridge History of Iran*, vol III, and her edition of the Sasanian Lawbook, *Sasanidskii Sudebnik. Mātakdān ī hazār dātastān* (Erevan, 1973), whose English edition should appear imminently. Despite the suggestion of N. Pigulevskaja, *Les Villes de l'état iranien aux époques parthe et sassanide* (Paris, 1963), p. 106 that the *Sasanian Lawbook* should be related to the *Syrian Code* of Išoboyt, and some indications that Roman practices were known to Iranian jurists, A. Pagliaro, "Riflessi di diritto romano nella dottrina sassanide", *La Persia e il mondo Greco-Romano* (Roma, 1966), pp. 15—16, insists, in agreement with Perikhanian, that «era naturale che depositarii del diritto fondato sulla religione continuassero a essere i sacerdoti e che la religione continuasse a ispirare il formarsi del diritto»... pp. 25—26, «Comunque, è da tenere presente che vi è ~~da tenere presente che vi è~~ una profonda diversità nello spirito e la forma tra il MhD e i libri di diritto siro — romani... Se concordanze ci sono tra il diritto iranico come risulta dalle elaborazioni dei giuristi ricordate nel MhD e il diritto romano (talune concordanze sembrano innegabili), esse non si possono spiegare se non sul piano della dottrina al di fuori della legislazione». Further legal considerations must await the further study of the *Sasanian Lawbook* and its application to Armenian society.

49 For the interference of Justinian in the Armeno-Iranian laws of property-transfer from generation to generation and the appointment of imperial counts as governors of his

portion of Armenia, see, the "Edict on Armenian Succession", *CJC*, 6th ed. III, pp. 760—761 = Adontz, *Armenia*, Appendix I, pp. 37*—38*, and *Novellae* XXI and XXXI, *CJC*, III, pp. 144 sqq., and 235 sqq. = Adontz, *Armenia*, Appendix I, pp. 32*—37*, as well as MX III, xlvi, p. 316 [= MK II, p. 114/5]. The de-Armenization of the Imperial territories resultant from Justinian's reforms in Armenia are discussed in Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 141—164, especially in chapter IX, pp. 155—164.

50 The omnipresent themes of the hunt and banquet are so deeply and substantially ingrained in the Iranian tradition that they cannot be done justice in so brief a space. Only a few of their aspects will be considered here; I shall return to others and attempt to investigate some of their deeper implications elsewhere.

51 Both historical and epic tradition stress the importance of horsemanship in the training of a young nobleman or prince. For the classical testimonies, in addition to Herodotus' famous observation, *Histories*, I, 136, «... παιδείναι δὲ τοὺς παῖδας ἀπὸ πενταήτεος ἀρχόμενοι μέχρι εἰκοσαήτεος τρία μῶνα, ἵππεύειν καὶ τοξεύειν καὶ ἀληθίζεσθαι» = Strabo, *Geography*, XV, iii, 18, see also Xenophon, *Cyropaedia*, I, ii, 8—12, especially 10; Tac. *Ann.*, II, ii, and II, lvi, «...favor nationis [Armenae] inclinabat in Zenonem, Polemonis regis Pontici filium, quod is prima ab infantia instituta et cultum Armeniorum aemulatus, venatu, epulis et quae aliae barbari celebrant, procures plebemque iuxta devinxerat».

The Iranian testimonies are far too numerous to detail, but both the young Ardašir in the *Kārnamag*, Sanjana, I, xxiii, xxiv, xxviii—xxx, pp. 5—7 = Antiā, iv—vi, xi—xii, pp. 6—8, and Bahrām Gōr in the *Šahnāma*, V, pp. 401—402, are trained in the hunting and horsemanship befitting a prince, which are the constant concern of the *Šahnāma*. The same training was given to the young Armenian nobles according to a passage which might easily be fitted into almost any section of the *Šahnāma*, LP', I, vii, pp. 10—11. In order to ingratiate himself to the Armenian nobles, the non-Arsacid king Šapuh son of Yazdgard unsuccessfully tempted them with hunts and banquets, MX III, lv, p. 330 [= MK II, p. 142/3].

52 The ubiquitous presence of the hunting theme in the *Šahnāma* has already been indicated. The archaeological material on this theme is likewise amazingly plentiful as was observed by AM, XXIV, vi, 3 «... in agro con-sedimus opulento... cuius in medio diversorium opacum est et amoenum, gentiles picturas per omnes aedium partes ostendens, regis bestias venatione multiplici trucidantis; nec enim apud eos pingitur vel fingitur aliud praeter varias caedes et bella», cf. Apollinaris Sidonius,

Panegyrici, «Anthemio Augusto», Carmen II, vv. 35—46, 133—155; Epistula ix, «Tonantio suo», ii, 5; Carmen xv, vv. 116 sqq.

For illustrations see R. Ghirshman, *Persian Art* (New York, 1962) [= *Persian Art*], figs. 236—238, 229, 224, for the Sasanian reliefs and frescoes at Taq-i Bostan, Čahar Tarxan and Susa, figs., 125, 122, 69, 63, 62, 61, 39; for the Parthian and contemporary reliefs, stuccoes, frescoes, graffiti, fragments and seals from Tang-i Sarwak, Dura Europos, Sami, Nisa, and for the fifth century B. C. Çavuş-köy stele representing both a hunt and a banquet thus indicating the antiquity of both themes in Anatolia. See also, Frye, *Persia*, figs., 88—101, 104 for illustrations of «The Hunt and Horses», especially fig. 94, for the Dura fresco of Mithra the Hunter; and the University of Michigan Museum of Art Catalogue. *Sasanian Silver* (1967) [= *Sasanian Silver*], fig. 69, for the stucco relief of a horseman from a private collection, as well as the *Bulletin of the Cleveland Museum of Art*, LI/4 (April, 1964) [= *Cleveland Bulletin*], front cover and figs. 2—3 for the alabaster relief plaque of Ardašir II (?).

The magnificent Sasanian silver plates probably present the quintessence of the hunt motif in Iranian art, see *Persian Art*, figs., 245, 247—254, 314; *Sasanian Silver*, figs., 2—10; *Cleveland Bulletin*, p. 80 and figs., 5—6, 11, 15. For the great Hermitage collection, the standard work is J. A. Orbeli and K. Trever, *Orfèvrerie sassanide* (Leningrad, 1935), see also the coloured reproductions issued as part of *The Hermitage Collections*, XI. *Sasanian Silverware* (Leningrad, 1973).

The spread of the hunt motif in Transcaucasia is perhaps best illustrated in the charming relief of a galloping archer shooting at a group of three deer carved on the side wall of the Sion church at Ateni in Georgia. The persistence of the theme shows itself in the familiar group of «Sasanian» textiles, e. g. *Persian Art*, figs., 285—289, 445; *Sasanian Silver*, fig., 68; in the eighth century Yenisei bronzes, *Persian Art*, fig., 437; the twelfth century saints of Transcaucasia, e. g. on the East façade of the eleventh century church at Nikortsminda in Georgia, *Pamiatniki arkhitektury Gruzii* (Leningrad, 1973), pls. 46—47, etc.

⁵³ Classical authors noted that the Armenian kings normally rode on horseback, DC, LXII, iii, 3, and that it was a patent humiliation for them to dismount, *Ibid.*, XXXVI, lii, 3, «Πομπήως δὲ ἀπὸ μὲν τοῦ ἵππου κατεβίβασεν αὐτὸν [Τιγράνῃ], ... (προσέβλεψε γὰρ ὡς καὶ ἐς αὐτὸ τὸ ἔρμα κατὰ τὸ σφέτερον ἔθος ἱππεύων)». ...» Just as in the case of Iranian literature, examples of the king hunting are too common in the Armenian sources to permit a detailed listing, see e. g. Aa, ccxi, p. 113 = Ag, lxxxix,

p. 225 [= CHAMA I, p. 150], «Արդ՝ անորս վեց ի խոր տխրութեան եւ յանհաւին տրամաբեան կացեալ թագաւորն ... ապա յետ սցարիկ ժամ տուեալ որոյ՝ ...», where the king's absence from the hunt in sign of mourning is corroborated by Suetonius, *Lives of the Caesars*, J. C. Rolfe tr. (London — Cambridge, Mass., 1941), «Caius Caligula», v, «... ad indicium maximi luctus; regum etiam regem et exercitatione venandi et convictu megistanum abstinuisse, quod apud Parthos iustiti instar est».

Hunting scenes abound in P'B and MX, and it is interesting to note that the «Master of the Royal Hunt» is singled out by his office, որսակա, rather than by his family name, Varaznuni in the *Gahnamaks*, Adontz, *Armenia*, Appendix III, pp. 68*, 71*; cf. MX I, xii; II, vii, xi, pp. 42, 110, 121 [= MK I, pp. 60/1, 152/3, 70/1]; Adontz, *Armenia*, p. 206; Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 222 n. 268, 230 n. 279. Like his Iranian counterparts, the Armenian kings supervised the planting of great forests near their residences as preserves for wild animals, as we know from such passages as P'B III, viii, pp. 28—29 [= CHAMA I, p. 216], MX I, vi; III, vii, pp. 108, 265 [= MK I, p. 148/9; II, p. 18/9] any of which might easily be descriptions of the «paradises» depicted on the reliefs of Tag-i Bostan or more schematically at Čahar Tarxan, *Persian Art*, figs., 229, 236—238. The creation of such paradises by Bahrām Gōr is similarly recorded by Mas'ūdī, I, # 596, p. 228. So excellent were these preserves of the Armenian kings, that they were far from eager to expose them to the envious eyes of the Persian marzban, all the while they conceded that hunting parties and banquets were the only suitable entertainment for a Persian grandee, P'B III, xx, pp. 79—80 [= CHAMA I, p. 230]. Vide infra nn. 58—59, for the theme of the banquet.

⁵⁴ *Kārnamag*, Sanjana, I, xxxviii—xxxix, p. 8 = Antiā, II, xix—xx, p. 9 The lesson is driven home even more clearly in the *Sāhnāma*, V, xxi, pp. 224—225. In general the man on foot is publicly and demonstrably humiliated, as was the case of Tigran II before Pompey (see preceding note). See also the episodes in MX II, lxxxii, p. 225 [= MK I, p. 346/7] where King Trdat unexpectedly and «voluntarily» fights on foot as an unusual manifestation or in Mas'ūdī, I, # 636, pp. 238—239, where Hassān b. Hanzala b. Hayya at-Tā's is recompensed for giving his own horse to the dismounted Xusrō II because, «... je n'ai pas souffert qu'il se entraîna à pied au milieu des cavaliers». In the romance of *Vis and Ramin*, G. Morrison tr. (New York, 1972), pp. 342—343, king Moubad misses his shot at a wild boar, falls with his horse, is gored to death, and so «... meets his last day in this wretched humiliation». A dis-

mounted hero is a contradiction in terms, the evil one's horse stumbles and falls, e. g. al-Tha'alibī, pp. 16, 63, or the symbolic death of Yazdgard "the Sinner" killed by the magic white horse risen from the waters in the *Šāhnāma*, V, xxxiv, pp. 417–418.

⁵⁵ The arousal of Aršak II's envy against his nephew Gnel because of a more fruitful hunt which leads to the young man's death, MX III, xxiii pp. 283–284 [= MK II, pp. 50/1–52/3] is derived from the same suspicion that leads Ardawān to drive the young Ardašīr from the hunting field for besting the shot of the king's son, *Kārnamag*, Sanjana, I, xxviii–xl, pp. 6–8 = Antiā, II, x–xxii, pp. 7–9, and *Šāhnāma*, V, xxi, pp. 221–225. See preceding note.

⁵⁶ As a non-Arsacid, Šahpuh son of Yazdgard I is not a "legitimate" king, and the Armenian historian consequently describes with leisuely pleasure his cowardice and effeminacy during the hunt, a cowardice which is thrown into still greater relief by the contemptuous bravery of the attending Armenian magnates, Atom Mokac'i and Šawasp Arcruni, MX III, lv, pp. 330–331 [= MK II, pp. 142/3–144/5]. See the preceding note for the episode of Ardašīr and Ardawān's son.

⁵⁷ For Ardašīr, see *Kārnamag*, Sanjana, I, xxiii–xxiv, xxxiii, xxxvi, pp. 5–7 = Antiā, II, iv–vii, x–xvi, pp. 6–8. For Hormizd/Aūharmazda son of Šahpuhr, *Kārnamag*, Sanjana, XIII, i–xvii, pp. 53–55 = Antiā, XVIII, iii–xix, pp. 43–44. In the second case, the prince reveals himself at a game of polo rather than during the hunt, but both settings for unusual physical prowess and daring belong to one and the same tradition. See also MX III, xl, pp. 307–308 [= MK II, p. 96/7] for Varazdat whose "glory" was celebrated at the Olympic games.

⁵⁸ As in the case of the hunt with which it is constantly linked, as has already been seen, the prevalence of the banquet as part and parcel of social life was recorded as much in the Armenian *History* of P'awstos Buzand, as in the Epic of the *Šāhnāma*. According to the religious tradition of the *Dēnkart*, "...il y eut 7 perfections que l'éminent roi Kay Vištāsp obtint. ...La quatrième perfection était de donner tous les jours un festin sous les portiques de son palais ...", J. de Menasce tr., *Le Troisième livre du Dēnkart* (Paris, 1973), # 389, p. 346 = Molé, *Culte*, p. 59.

The places assigned to the Iranian nobles during royal banquets are mentioned in the *Letter of Tansar*, p. 44, "The King of kings... has set differences among the nobles themselves with regard to entrance — and dringing-places, sitting- and standing-places, ... according to the dignity of each man's rank; ...", cf. pp. 63 and 66 m. 7. The order of precedence was set out

even more clearly in the *Livre de la Couronne*, p. 129; a similar ceremonial seems indicated in the *Ayīn*, pp. 112–113, 113 n. 4, 116. The memory of this tradition was preserved by both Mas'ūdī, I # 583, p. 219; and Tha'alibī, pp. 54, 65, 73, who seems to be describing a scene such as the one on the "Investiture" relief from Tang-i Sarwak, where a reclining ruler attended by dignitaries wearing various robes and carrying diverse insignia is depicted, *Persian Art*, fig. 67. The examples from the *Šāhnāma* are too numerous to permit recording.

The best example of the banquet as an index of precedence at the Armenian court is found in the regulations following the enthronization of Aršak II, P'B IV, ii, pp. 103–104 [= CHAMA I, p. 236], which provide for "every magnate on his throne". The equality of the Armenian ruler and the Persian King of kings is underscored by the fact that they sit on the same throne at banquets and wear identical robes, P'B, IV, xvi, pp. 192–193 [= CHAMA I, p. 254], «Յայնմ ժամանակի կոչէր առ ինքն Շապուհ արքայն Պարսից զԹագաւորն Հայոց զԱրշակ. եւ մեծարեցաւ ի նմանէ բազում պատուով եւ մեծաւ փառօր, ... եւ իբրեւ զեղբայր որպէս զորդին գրգեալ եղև ի նմանէ... եւ ի միասին ի միում տախտի զահուռն ի ժամ ուրախութեանն բազմէին, զմիազոյն զմիանշան զհամահանդերձ զարդու: եւ զմիօրինակ զթագն օր ըստ օրէ ինքեան եւ նմա թագաւորն Պարսից զարդ պատրաստէր. զոյգ երկուքին ի միայն որպէս զեղբարս հարազատս անբաժինս յղիսցեալք էին ի միում ուրախութեան, ...». The identical ceremonial is the setting for Aršak's disgrace, when his seat of equality is significantly denied to him at the royal feast, P'B IV, liv, pp. 254–255 [= CHAMA I, p. 271]. The insult of Rustam by Esfandiar also has as setting a banquet to which Rustam is at first not invited and at which he is subsequently offered a place not consonant with his rank and valour, *Šāhnāma*, IV, xv, pp. 487–493.

⁵⁹ The humiliation of Sasanian Armenian king Šapuh at a banquet follows his disgrace during the hunt and the game of polo, and so concludes the cycle of his patent baseness and unworthiness, in MX III, lv, p. 331 [= MK II, pp. 144/5–146/7]. Vide supra n. 56 for Šapuh's earlier cowardice.

For the Sasanian plates representing the glory of the king at court banquets, see *Persian Art*, figs., 242, 245–246, 259; *Sasanian Silver* pls. 12–16, R. Ghirshman, *Scènes de banquet sur l'argenterie sassanide*, *Artibus Asiae* XVIII (1953), pp. 51 sqq.

⁶⁰ Nersēs I's injunction against incestuous marriages is carefully repeated by both P'B IV, iv, p. 117 [= CHAMA I, p. 239], and MX III, xx, p. 280 [= MK II, p. 44/5]. The practical consideration of keeping property within the family cited by MX may well have played a part

in such marriages, but the insistence of both historians on this precept which they attribute to St. Nersēs suggests rather a concern with the survival of the religious practice of the *χωετῦκδας* < OP *χῠaētvadada* found in both Vd. 8.13 and Y 12.9 as well as Dk 9.38 paraphrasing Yt. 45.4, etc., *Dēnkart*, # 80, pp. 85–90. In addition to the Zoroastrian scriptures, the piety and virtue of the consanguinous marriage are praised in the *Testament*, pp. 81 and n. 57, as well as in the *Nihayat*, pp. 206, 211, where the precept is attributed to Zoroaster himself; although p. 221, Bahrām II is said to have rejected Zoroastrianism because of this practice, an explanation which may well be due to later Muslim piety. The same preconization of the consanguinous marriage is still found in Mas'ūdi, I, # 587, p. 220, where it is attributed to Ardašīr, and, albeit less enthusiastically in Bel'āmi, I, lxviii, p. 276. The mythological background of this custom is referred to in Ezriq's discussion of Zurvanism, p. 152, and its religious character is acknowledged in certain Classical sources: Xanthos (?), *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*, C. Müller ed. (Paris, 1928), I, fg. xxviii, p. 43, and Strabo, *Geography*, XV, iii, 20. On this practice see, L. Gray, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, VIII, pp. 456 sqq.; J. Duchesne Guillemin, *Religion*, pp. 127–128; Widengren, *Religions*, pp., 256 sqq. and 319 sqq.; A. Mazaheri, *La Famille iranienne aux temps préislamiques* (Paris, 1938), pp. 113 sqq., Molé, *Culte*, pp. 131–132, 330, 359, 426–427, 436, etc.

⁶¹ As already noted several times (Vide supra nn. 7, 13, 36), the Iranian epic components in both Armenian historiography and mythology have been extensively but not exhaustively discussed in Armenian scholarly works to which should be added Melik' Ōhanjanyan's study of Iranian epic motifs in Ancient Armenian literature in *Firdusi Zolovacu* (Erevan, 1934), pp. 1–116 as well as his numerous other researches; A. Lanalanyan, *Avandapatum* (Erevan, 1969), and others.

Of particular interest for Armenian historical literature is the clearly Iranian tale of the hidden royal or princely child raised among strangers, preferably shepherds, and returning to claim his rightful inheritance. The Iranian examples, beginning with the young Cyrus, Herodotus, *Histories*, I, 107–127, by way of the legendary Kay Xusrō or Zal of the *Šāhnāma*, I, pp. 167–178; II, 333–339, etc., the Parthian Mithridates, Justin, *Epitoma*, XXXVII, ii, 4–9, and the young Ardašīr, *Kārnamag*, Sanjana, I, i–xxvi, pp. 1–6 = Antiā, I, xii, pp. 1–8, have long since been familiar. The Armenian hidden heirs: Gregory, Trdat, Spandarat, Perozamat, etc., have already been mentioned as illustrations of the Armenian concept of clan property (vide supra n. 47). There is no doubt,

however, that these tales are also to be linked with their Iranian prototypes, since the account of Artasēs son of Sanatruck, MX II, xxxvi–xxxviii, xlili, pp. 160–164, 168 [= MK I, pp. 236/7–242/3, 250/1] is a patent calque of the childhood of Cyrus in Herodotus, and MX moreover refers directly to Persian legends in his account of young Perozamat served by animals, MX II, lxxiii, p. 210 [= MK I, p. 322/3]. On the hidden child tale, see Th. Nöldeke, *Das iranische Nationalepos*, 2nd. ed. (Berlin, 1920); G. Widengren, «La légende royale dans l'Iran antique», *Hommages à Georges Dumézil* (Brussels, 1960), pp. 228–231, 236–237, Dumézil, *Idéologie*, pp. 82, 86–88; R. Frye, «The Charisma of Kingship in Ancient Iran», *Iranica Antiqua*, IV/1 (1964), pp. 40–42, etc. The best account of the oral transmission of the epic tradition through musicians and minstrels (MP *gōsān* > Arm. *gusan*) undoubtedly remains Boyce's *Gōsān*, see also, Frye, *Charisma*, pp. 44–45. References to Persian tales and the songs of Golt'n are found in MX I, xxx–xxxii, pp. 84–86 [= MK I, pp. 122/3–124/5], MX II, xlviii–xlix, pp. 175–176 [= MK I, pp. 262/3] and particularly the section separating books I and II, pp. 89–92 [= MK I, pp. 132/3–136/7], see B. Čukaszian, «Legenda o Biuraspi Azhdakhake po Movsesu Khorenatsi», *Arevelagitakan Jolovacu*, I (Erevan, 1960) pp. 303–329. The presence of *gusans* was a necessary part of Armenian as well as Iranian court banquets even in the most tragic circumstances, see MX II, lxiii, p. 195 [= MK I, pp. 296/7–298/9], III, xix, p. 278 [= MK II, pp. 40/1], III, lv, pp. 330–331 [= MK II, p. 146/7] for the insult of the Sasanian king of Armenia, Šapuh, by Xosrov Gardmanac'i; P'B V, vii, pp. 310–311 [= CHAMA I, pp. 286–287], for the attempt of the eunuch Drastamat to raise the spirits of Aršak II in the «Castle of Forgetfulness» before the king's suicide; or the sumptuous banquet setting for Pap's assassination, P'B V, xxxii, pp. 347–348 [= CHAMA I, p. 296]. Visual testimony as to the presence of these entertainers at the Iranian court is provided by a number of representations on Sasanian silver vessels, *Sasanian Silver*, pls. 14–15, 21, etc.

⁶² The custom of granting honourific crowns and robes to dignitaries, especially at banquets, is attested as much in Armenia as in Iran, and the differentiation among various ranks was carefully observed so that identification could be immediate, e. g. *Letter of Tansar*, p. 44; *Livre de la Couronne*, p. 129. Far more detailed are the careful differentiations attributed to Ardašīr in his *Ay'n*, pp. 113–114, as well as in Mas'ūdi, I 662, pp. 247–248; Bel'āmi, I, xxxix, p. 403; *Nihāyat*, p. 220. Variations can be observed in the dress and crowns of the attending nobles at Tang-i Sarwak, *Persian Art*, fig. 67 and the

granting of robes and honourific crowns is systematically referred to in the *Šāhnāma*. Similarly in Armenia, MX I, xiii, p. 44 [= MK I, 64/5], the Assyrian king Ninus is said to have granted to the mythical Aram of Armenia the right to wear a pearl diadem, a reminiscence of the one represented on the effigies of Tigran II on the famous ~~tetradrachms~~ commemorating the capture of Antioch in 84 B. C. and of the diadems of the Parthian kings, *Persian Art*, pls. 100, 102, 124, 139, 148, etc. Such a grant of crowns is also depicted at Tang-i Sarwak, *Ibid.*, fig. 67, on the relief of Artabanus V from Susa, *Ibid.*, fig. 70, and probably on the silver banquet plate from Baltimore, *Sasanian Silver*, p. 13. Honourific garb was also sent by the King of kings to the Armenian court, P'B V, xxxvi, pp. 367—368 [= CHAMA I, p. 301].

In Armenia as in Iran, each court official had his special garb which was carefully differentiated from any other, MX II, xlvi, p. 174 [= MK I, pp. 258/9-260/1], «Իսկ Արտաշէի տոեալ զթագաւորութիւնն... Տայ էւ տոն քաջի էւ պատուականի Արգամայ զխոստացեալ քահն երկրորդական, էւ պառկ յակնթակապ, էւ գինդ յերկոսին տկանն, էւ կարմիր զէսառ միւր տախն, տարբալ ունել ոսկի էւ պատառաքաղ, էւ ոսկեղինօք ըմպել նուազօք: Եւ ոչ ինչ ընդհատ յայց պատուոց տայ դպեկին իւրում Սմբատայ, բայց միայն յերկուց զնպսն էւ ի կարմիր կօշէ. էւ աւելի քան զհայրենական զիւր թագակապ ասպետութիւն էւ զիշխանութիւնն արեւմտեան զօրուն...». See also the distinctive attributes of Nersēs I as *senekapet*, before his episcopal ordination. P'B IV, iii, pp. 107—109 [= CHAMA I, p. 237]. Not only were such robes granted for specific services, but they could be taken away as a sign of disgrace, P'B III, xxi, p. 87 [= CHAMA I, p. 232], «Ապա ի վեր եկին էւ յայանցան ինքն առաջի նորա, զի... առնել զայն ամբոխ խոռվութեան ի մոլեկան տունէն Շապուհ Վարդապետ: Ապա հրաման ետ հանել զպատու ի բաց, էւ մերկանալ ի նմանէ զպատուական պատմունան, ...». see also the relish with which Ehišē, p. 136—137 [= CHAMA II, pp. 227—228] describes the downfall and public disgrace of the arch-traitor Vasak Siwni. Even in minor details regarding the type of precious metals or jewels permitted to a specific official, the protocol of the Armenian court apparently followed the prescriptions of Iran, since the restriction that the diadem of the *tagadir* should be adorned with pearls alone to the exclusion of gold jewels, MX II, vii, p. 110 [= MK I, p. 152/3], seems taken directly from the *Āyīn of Ardašīr*, p. 114, «Nous avons constitué la société en classes... nous avons permis toute la superbe de l'or, de l'argent et des bijoux à certains hommes, mais nous avons exclu de ce privilège certains bijoux. Ensuite nous avons défendu le privilège des bijoux à d'autres, tout en leur permettant l'or. Enfin, nous avons défendu le privilège de l'or de l'argent et des

joyaux à d'autres...». Finally, it is interesting that the fatal gift of over-ample robes and trousers which bring about the death of the *mardpet*, Diak, because the heavy folds make him stumble and tangle in his sword scabbard seem curiously reminiscent of the heavy garments of the king at Taq-i Bostan, of the Parthian dress from Palmyra and Matheira, of the Olbia ivory plaques, and particularly of the pleated tunic, cloak and trousers of the second century Kushan prince from Kabul, *Persian Art*, figs., 290, 349, 351—352, 361. Both in Iran and in Armenia, identical colour of dress indicated identical rank. Thus, on state occasions, Aršak II of Armenia and Šāhpuhr II shared not only identical thrones and diadems, but garments of the same colour, P'B IV, xvi, p. 193 [= CHAMA I, p. 254], «...ի միասին ի միում տախտի դահուն ի ժամ ուրախութեանն բազմէին, զմիազոյն զմիանշան զհամահանդերձ զարդուն:» This custom must have derived from the ancient differentiation of social class by colour, e.g. *Āyīn*, p. 113 «Ces vêtements possèdent en effet une splendeur et une joie qui se révèle dans la couleur». Cf. Widengren, *Religions*, pp. 153, 179, 270, and G. Dumézil, «La Ripsula et la structure sociale indo-européenne», *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, (1954). Indeed, both Grousset, *Histoire*, p. 89 and Widengren, *Religions*, p. 270, observed that the purple and white dress attributed to Tigran of Armenia matches the double colouration (priestly and warrior) of the Persian kings, DC XXXVI, lii, 3—4, cf. Quintus Curtius, *Histoires*, H. Bardon ed. and tr., 2nd ed. (Paris, 1961), III, xxx, p. 11 and Strabo, *Geography*, XV, iii, 19.

Finally, in both countries magnates displayed coats of arms. The mighty «lords with contingents and banners» who advise the king in P'B I, viii, p. 104 [= CHAMA I, p. 236], «...զնդից էւ զբօռուց տեարք», who seem to have proliferated in the late Parthian period, Frye, *Persia*, p. 183, are the very ones summoned by the legendary kings of Iran according to Bel'āmi, I, ci, p. 471 «...Kaī Khosrou fit venir séparément chaque général qui avait des hommes et un drapeau, le loua et le récompensa selon son mérite». The coats of arms are equally clearly visible on the great relief of Firūzābād celebrating the inauguration of the Sasanian dynasty through the victory of Ardašīr over Ardawān V, *Persian Art*, figs. 163—166.

⁶³ Space does not permit the discussion here of a whole series of similarities between the two traditions, such as, for instance, the qualities expected of the hero or ruler. Thus, the superhuman strength of Bahrām II, single handedly affronting lions on the Sar Mašhad relief — a favourite theme of near Eastern art — *Persian Art*, fig. 215 = Frye, *Persia*, pl. 93; the symbolic representation of the Sasanian state by the wild boar of Vərəθragna, *Ibid.*, pls. 98—104; the heroic

proportions of "elephant-bodied" Rustam or Sorhab among others, *Šāhnāma*, I, viii, pp. 278—284, 354—357, II, pp. 64—68, et passim, known to MX II, vii, pp. 114—115 [= MK I, p. 160/1]; and Rustam's exploits, such as the killing of the white eleplant, *Šāhnāma*, I, vii, pp. 286—288, all find their counterparts in the heroic deeds attributed to Trdat I, Trdat the Great and even the late king Varazdat in both Classical and Armenian sources: DC LXIII, iii, 2; *Aa*, xli—xliii, cxxiii, cci, pp. 27—28, 71, 108—109 [= CHAMA I, pp. 124, 133, 147]; MX II, lxxix, lxxxii, III, xl, pp. 217—218, 225, 307—308 [= MK I, pp. 334/5, 336/7; II, p. 96/7], as well as in the superhuman prowess of Smbat Bagratuni at Constantinople, Sebēos, x, pp. 53—55. The duties of the good Iranian ruler (e. g. *Letter of Tansar*, p. 67; *Šāhnāma*, passim, etc.) clichés though they may be, find their parallels in the re-ordering of the kingdom of Armenia approvingly described by P'B IV, i—ii, pp. 101—110 [= CHAMA I, pp. 235—236] or MX II, vi, viii, pp. 108—118 [= MK I, pp. 148/9—166/7] and especially MX II, viii, p. 117 [= MK I, p. 164/5] which is a paraphrase and nearly a quotation of the pattern set in the *Letter of Tansar*, p. 44. Even seeming disagreements between the Armenian and the Iranian traditions in matters of burial and mourning customs do not seem as categorical on more detailed study as they appear at first glance, see e. g. CD, LXVIII/LXXIX, i, 1/2 (IX, 340/1) on Antoninus' sack of Arbela: "[he] dug open the royal tombs of the Parthians, and scattered the bones about", and the existence of the royal Armenian Arsacid tomb at Ałc.

⁶⁴ AM XVII, v, 3, «Rex regum Sapor, particeps siderum, frater Solis et Lunae, Constantio Caesari fratri meo salutem plurimam dico». This formula of the Zoroastrian chancellery for the Mazda-worshipping sun-like King of Kings is confirmed by MX III, xvii, p. 276 [= MK II, p. 36/7], «Մազդեզանե քաջ էւ բարձակից արեգական Շապուհ արքայից արքայ, ի բարունջ մերում իշխակ եղբայր սիրելի Տիրան Հայոց արքայ ողջոյն շատ»: Vide infra, n. 66 for the hereditary character of the Kayān "glory" and its occasional loss.

⁶⁵ The enormously complex and complicated discussion of "fate" MP. *bayt*, or Av. *bayō*. *baytā* = Arm. *bayt*, and particularly "glory", Av. *χvaranah* > MP. *χwarrah* > NP. *farr* = Arm. *p'ā'k'* (OP, pp. 199, 208; D. N. Mac Kenzie, *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary* (London, 1971), pp. 16—17, 96, 116; Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 115—116, 254) in the Iranian religious and epic tradition cannot profitably be entered into here, nor is there any need to repeat "what was oft and better said" by Bailey, *Problems*, pp. xvi—xxiv, 1—78; Molé, *Culte*, pp. 92—94, 128—129, 144, 276—277, and especially, 284—343, 390—419, 434—445, et passim; H. Ringgren, *Fata-*

lism in Persian Epics (Uppsala — Wiesbaden, 1952 [= *Fatalism*]; A. Christensen, *Les Gestes des rois dans les traditions de l'Iran antique* (Paris, 1936); *Le Premier homme et le premier roi dans la tradition populaire des Iraniens*, II (Leyden, 1934) [= *Premier homme*], and many others. The locus classicus for the *χwarrah* is the *Zamyād Yašt*, F. M. Müller ed., *The Sacred Books of the East* (Oxford, 1880), XXIII, xix, pp. 286—309, but, as indicated in the literature cited above, references to it abound through the earlier and later scriptures and commentaries, as well as in the epic and romantic tales of the *Šāhnāma*, *Vis u Ramin*, et al. Only a few aspects of the royal "*Kayān χwarrah*" and its relations to political concepts and formulations will be indicated here, leaving a more detailed analysis to a later stage of this investigation.

⁶⁶ It is evident from the Zoroastrian scriptures and commentaries that

a) The divine *χwarrah* protects all creatures — be it Zoroaster himself (Molé, *Culte*, 294—297) or others, kings or heroes — who perform the good works which will speed the renovation of the world: "We sacrifice unto the awful kingly Glory made by Mazda; ... That belonged to Ahura Mazda, as (through it) Ahura Mazda made the creatures... So that they may restore the world, which will (thenceforth) never grow old and never die... *Zamyād Yašt*, II, ix—xi, p. 290.

"We sacrifice unto the awful kingly Glory made by Mazda... That belongs to the gods in heaven and to those in the material world, and to the blessed ones born or not yet born, who are to perform the restoration of the world", *Ibid.*, IV, xxi—xxiii, p. 291, also V, VI, p. 292. Cf. Molé, *Culte*, pp. 394, 434—438; Ringgren, *Fatalism*, p. 96, etc. In the *Kārnamag*, Antiā, XII, iv, p. 28 = Sanjana, VII, i, p. 30, "It is said that the Kingly Glory stood before Artikhshīr in the form of a wild ass and preceded him with measured steps until he extricated himself from that dangerous place unhurt by his enemies, and reached a town called Mānak".

b) This divine "grace" abandons the sinful king, *Zamyād Yašt*, xxx—xxxvi, xxxvi, pp. 293—295, "We sacrifice unto the awful kingly Glory, made by Mazda... That clave unto bright Yima, the good shepherd, for a long time... In whose reign there was neither cold wind nor hot wind, neither old age nor death, nor envy made by the Daēvas, in the time before his lie, before he began to have delight in words of falsehood and untruth. But when he began to find delight in words of falsehood and untruth, the Glory was seen to flee away from him in the shape of a bird. When his Glory had disappeared, then the great Yima Khshaētra, the good shepherd, trembled and was in sorrow before his

foes; he was confounded and laid his on the ground". Similarly the unjust king Naudar loses the *χwarrah*, *Sāhnāma* I, viii, p. 304 = Ringgren, *Fatalism*, p. 98 "He hath made earth a desert, his fortune (*baḫt*) that was wakeful is asleep, he walketh not in wisdom's way, the Grace (*farrah*) of God hath left him". A particularly succinct summary of these two aspects is given by Christensen, *Premier Homme*, II, p. 51, «...la 'Gloire', *χvarānah*, manifestation spéciale du feu, qui selon la foi zoroastrienne, accompagne le porteur légitime de la couronne et s'échappe des mains de l'usurpateur... de même qu'elle quitte le prince légitime s'il commence à mener une vie contraire à la justice, aux lois et à la morale.», vide infra no. 69 for the transfer of the *χwarrah* from Ardawān the Parthian to the Sasanian Ardašīr, and MX II, lxx, p. 206 [= MK I, p. 316/7] for the fire which burst from Sasan. On the Parthian coinage, the king is usually represented receiving his crown and consequently his legitimacy from the hands of the *χwarrah* represented in the form of a victory, see M. Rostovtzeff, *Dura and the Problem of Parthian Art* (New Haven, 1935), p. 175, and J. de Morgan, *Manuel de numismatique orientale*, I (Paris, 1923—1936), p. 139, fig. 143.

The royal *χwarrah* was hereditary in that it was attached to the family of the Kayāns, *Zamyād Yašt*, ix, just as we shall see that it is tied to that of the Armenian Arsacids, Molé, *Culte*, p. 450, «...le *χvarrah* de la royauté fut transmis ainsi par filiation de Taḫmorap à la majesté présente; les Kayanides qui exercent la royauté sont toujours de la même race», cf. *Dēnkart*, V, 4; Ringgren, *Fatalism*, pp. 95—96; et infra n. 72, for the Armenian evidence.

As the *χwarrah* gives to creatures the capacity to perform the tasks of renovation allotted to each, so *baḫt* or *baḫō*. *baḫtā*, sets them on the divinely created ways leading to this renovation, Molé, *Culte*, p. 392; Ringgren, *Fatalism*, pp. 880—94.

⁶⁷ The linking of *baḫt* and *χwarrah* in the king has been repeatedly observed in the Iranian epic, e. g. Ringgren, *Fatalism*, pp. 86—87 (*ShN*, 13 b, 79), "Be earth the basis of thy crown and throne, and heaven (*falak*) the guardian of thy Grace (*farr*) and fortune (*baḫt*).", See also Bailey, pp. xvii and 1—78, passim. For earlier examples of these linked attributes associated with the king, it will be necessary to return to the Armenian testimonies, vide infra nn. 68, 70—71.

⁶⁸ The rendering of *baḫt* as *μοῖρα*, "fate" presents few difficulties. Such is not the case, however, for *χwarrah*, often rendered *δοξα*, "glory" (e. g. Nor Bargirk' *Haykazean Lezwī* (Venice, 1837), vol. II, p. 935, s. v. *φωτο*) rather than *τύχη* "fortune". Nevertheless, the interpretation of Ringgren, *Fatalism*, p. 94, and especially Bailey, *Problems*, p. xvii, where "farrah

is further equated with *baḫt* 'distributed, allotted share'...", as well as Bailey's commentary, pp. 38—39 on the well known passage in which Eznik, II, p. 125, makes the same equation, «*Զրուան ոմն անուն էր, որ թարգմանի բախտ կամ փառք*», all bring us closer to an equivalence with *τύχη*, see Bailey, *Problems*, p. 39, "It will now be clear that the ninth-century books and the earlier commentators understood by Mid. Pers. *χwarrah*, and claimed also for the Av. *χvarānah*, the meaning of 'fortune' and more specifically 'good fortune'...", cf. Molé, *Culte*, p. 437, also Widengren, *Mithraic Mysteries*, p. 443, "It seems quite sure that Fortuna-Tyche is the same figure as the Iranian *χvarnah*". As indicated in the preceding note, the Parthian coinage adopted the figure of the Seleucid *τύχη* for the representation of the royal *χwarrah*, thus providing one more indication of the association of the two concepts in Parthian times. In practical terms, the Greek translation of *χwarrah* must normally have been *τύχη*, since *δοξα* did not customarily take on its new meaning of "glory, splendour" until the translation of the Jewish Scriptures and to a greater degree yet in the New Testament. See, H. H. Lidell and R. Scott, *A Greek—English Lexicon*, rev. by H. S. Jones, 9th ed (Oxford, 1940; repr. 1953), pp. 444, s. v. *δοξα*, iv. Hence, as we shall see, Classical authors (with the exception of Plutarch, *Crassus*, xxi; *Alexander*, xxx) use *τύχη* whereas Ag, xiii, xxii, pp. 181, 190 et passim uses various forms of *δοξα* to render *Aa*, xxvi, liii, etc., pp. 20, 31 [= *CHAMA* I, pp. 118—119, 127], «*փառք, փառաւորք*». Vide infra n. 72, for Dio Cassius.

⁶⁹ *Kārnāmag*, Antiā, V. viii—xxiv, pp. 16—17 = Sanjana, III, vii—xx, pp. 16—18. Cf. *Sāhnāma*, V, pp. 233—234.

⁷⁰ *Aa* cxxvii, p. 73, «...ի մեր դիւցախան Պարթեւաց հասցէ այցելութիւն, ի փառաց թագաւորաց եւ ի քաջ նախնեաց.». It is interesting that this significant passage badly garbled in *CHAMA* I, p. 135, «...protection aux divin Parthes, descendants de nos aïeux», is altogether left out in Ag, lvii, p. 223, who apparently did not know what to make of this Iranian concept. Yet the formula is confirmed in the letter of Šāhpuhr III cited in MX III, xlii, p. 311 [= MK II, 104/5], «*Երրուեալ ի հուր եւ ի լուր եւ ի փառս անմահից իմոց նախնեաց*».

⁷¹ P'B IV, xxiv, pp. 220—222 [= *CHAMA* I, p. 26], «*Եւ բանային [Պարսք] զգերեզմանս զառաջին թագաւորացն Հայոց զարանց քաջաց զարչակունոյ, եւ խաղաղուցանէին ի գերութիւն զոսկերս թագաւորացն... Զի ասէին... թէ վասն այսորիկ բարձեալ տանիմք զոսկերս թագաւորացն Հայոց յաշխարհն մեր, զի փառք թագաւորացն եւ բախտն եւ քաջութիւն աշխարհիս աստի զնացեալ ընդ ոսկերս թագաւորացն յաշխարհն մեր եկեցան*». Cf. MX III, xxvii, pp. 288—289 [= MK II, p. 60/1], who no longer

understands the point of the story which he garbles, and DC LXXVII, i, 2. The significance of the passage of P'B was finally observed by Widengren, *Religions*, p. 272 and in the new Introduction added by Bailey to the 1971 edition of his *Problems*, p. xvii. It is also very interesting to note that Aršak II's valiance (բաշխութիւն) manifests itself over his army during his captivity as though he were personally present on the battlefield, P'B V, pp. 301—304 [= CHAMA I, pp. 283—284]). It is particularly tempting to speculate at this point whether the vaillance of Aršak II must be invoked because his successor, the reigning king Pap, is deprived of *χωρarah* because of his injustice and demonic possession.

⁷² DC LXII, v, 2, «... εἶπε γὰρ οὕτως· 'ἐγὼ-δέσποια, Ἀρσάκον μὲν ἔκγονος, Οὐλογοαῖσαν δὲ καὶ Πακόρον τῶν βασιλέων ἀδελφός, σὸς δὲ δοῦλός εἰμι· καὶ ἡλθὼν τε πρὸς σὲ τὸν ἐμὸν θεόν, πρόσκυνήσω σε ὡς καὶ Μιθραν, καὶ ἔσομαι το τοῦτο ὅ τι ἂν σὺ ἐπι-κλώῃς· σὺ γάρ μοι καὶ μοῖρα εἶ καὶ τύχη...». Since Dio carried his *History* down to his second consulship in 229 A. D. and probably did not live long thereafter (see, Introduction, I, p. x) it seems likely that he knew little of the contemporary Sasanian revolution in Iran, which he mentions only in passing as a relatively unimportant event, DC LXXX, iii, 2—iv, 1, and that he is consequently reproducing the earlier Parthian formulaic royal concept which the Sasanians took over despite their disavowal of their Arsacid predecessors. If so, the Armenian example cited by Dio Cassius greatly antedates the Iranian epic evidence and even that of P'B and Aa. H. P. L'Orange, "Expressions of Cosmic Kingship in the Ancient World", *La Regalità Sacra Studies in the History of Religion* (Leyden, 1959), p. 485, noted this passage, but not the formulaic character of the final phrase in Trdat's address to the emperor.

⁷³ Essentially, Benveniste, *Titres*, pp. 13—16, «Grâce à ces comparaisons où les deux langues s'éclairent mutuellement, la situation du parthe vis-à-vis de l'arménien apparaît comme celle du modèle en face du calque linguistique». The whole of Prof. Benveniste's seminar on Iranian dialectology at the Ecole des Hautes Etudes of the University of Paris (1961—1962), which I was privileged to attend by his kind permission, was devoted to this problem and to the reconstitution of the lost Parthian prototypes from the Armenian loan-word/

⁷⁴ Although the fourth estate is mentioned only once in the *Avesta*, Y 19.17, Sasanian and post-Sasanian literature is categoric as to its existence. Vide supra n. 43, especially for the *Letter of Tansar*. Cf. Dumézil, *Idéologie*; Ben-

veniste, *Classes Sociales*; Christensen, *Iran*, pp. 97—101; Frye, *Persia*, pp. 51—52, et al.

This development seems to have had little or no repercussion in Armenia where the four military divisions alluded to in MX II, viii, liii; III, vi, pp. 111, 83—184, 262 [=MK I, pp. 184/5, 276/7; II, p. 12/3] are clearly referring to the creation of the four *spāhpat*s replacing the sole *Erān spāhpat* in the reform usually attributed to Xusrō I (see e. g. Christensen, *Iran*, pp. 367—371), rather than to social classes. The classes normally referred to in Aa, or the listings in P'B, the *Gahnamaks*, or the *Book of Letters* show the classic Indo-European tripartite division: the clergy, the warriors — diversified into various ranks of magnates and knights (*azat*) — and an undiversified assembly of the people, vide supra n. 43. There is no mention of the institution of a chancellery in the ideal reforms attributed to Vaharšak or Artašir in MX II, vii—viii, lxxvii, pp. 109—118, 215—216 [=MK I, pp. 148/9—166/7, 330/1—332/3]. The very mention of two secretaries — one for benefactions and the other for "vengeances" — comes after an explicit tripartite subdivision of society, MX II, viii, p. 117 [=MK I, p. 164/5]. Nor can the officials, *դարձակալք* of P'B IV, ii, pp. 103—104 [=CHAMA I, p. 236] be placed in the Sasanian secretarial caste, since they are quite clearly magnates having rights to honourific positions in the king's presence.

Some of the great administrators of the Sasanian state such as the *hazarapet* = *vuzurg framātār* (Hübschmann, *Grammatik*, pp. 174, 182; Benveniste, *Titres*, pp. 67—71; Christensen, *Iran*, pp. 113—116; Frye, *Persia*, 93, 201—202; Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 339—348, 354—355; Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 205—206, n. 234) are undoubtedly known in Armenia, e. g. Koriwn, ii, 1, p. 11; MX II, lxxxiii, p. 224 [=MK I, p. 344/5]; P'B III, xii, IV, ii, pp. 45, 103 [=CHAMA I, pp. 221—222, 236], etc. For the most part, however, the title is used for Persian officials such as Mihrnerseh «մեծ հազարապետ» and «վարդի հրամանար երան հւ Անեբան», Ehišē II, pp. 24, 28 [=CHAMA II, pp. 290, 292]; LP, II, xx, xxxiii—xxxiv, pp. 39, 63—64 [=CHAMA II, pp. 278, 293], etc. Whether or not the *hazarapet* was the civilian counterpart of the military *sparapet* as argued by Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 339—340, 354—355, his was a hereditary charge belonging to the family of the Gnuni (P'B IV, ii, p. 103 [=CHAMA I, p. 236]) on a par with the other hereditary offices of the great magnates and, as such, he cannot be used as evidence for a developed bureaucracy in Armenia.

The same can be said for the presence of secretaries *դպիրք* (Hübschmann, *Grammatik*,

p. 145) at the Armenian court. There is no doubt that the Arsacid kings had a chancellery, since the learned Maštoc' became part of it, Koriwn, ii, 1, p. 11 «կայեալ յարքունական դիւանին լինել սպասուոր արքայատուր հրամանացն, առ հազարապետութեամբն աշխարհիս Հայոց...». Nevertheless, it is notable that no replacement could be found on his departure, MX III, lii, p. 325 [= MK II, p. 134/5], that at his return he was greeted by princes, and magnates, and clerics, but no *dpirs*, MX III, lviii, p. 337 [= MK II, p. 136/7]. Finally the absence of Armenian characters and the need to train a group of skilled scholars and translators, MX III, liv, pp. 328—329 [= MK II, pp. 138/9—140/1] does not argue for a strong native chancellery tradition or a scribal caste, any more than the need of St. Sahak to go to the archives in Ctesiphon to find a true copy of the Armenian *Gahnamak*, "Preface", Adontz, *Armenia*, pp. 191, 67*, or the tone of the description of the Sasanian chancellery traditions in MX III, li, p. 323 [= MK II, pp. 128/9—130/1], which leaves the impression of unfamiliar foreign practices. As in the case of the *hazarapet*, the *dpir* is often referred to as a Persian official: MX II, lxx, p. 206 [= MK I, p. 314/5], and especially LP' xxxiv, p. 64 [= CHAMA II, p. 293], cf. *Letter of Tansar*, p. 61 and n. 6, 41, n. 6. In short, despite the undoubted presence of court officials and a chancellery in Arsacid Armenia, and the occasional mention of judges, *գառաւորք*, P'B III, pp. 83—84 [= CHAMA I, p. 231] or a «*maître des offices*», *պաշտօնէիցն գլխաւոր*, P'B V, xxiv, p. 326 [= CHAMA I, p. 291], the evidence cannot sustain the thesis of the existence in the country of the elaborate bureaucracy forming the third estate of the Sasanian state.

75 For instance Xešay, the son of the *bdešx* Bakour, P'B III, ix, p. 33 [= CHAMA I, p. 218], «*Բայց յորդոցն Բակուր բղէլի պատանեակ մի փախեալ առ զօրավարն Հայոց Վաչէ, և անդ ապրեցաւ թաղուցեալ ի տան նորա: Որ առ յապա ժառանգ տան նորա լինէր: Որ յայլում ժամանակի դարձաւ կալաւ զտունն իւր. որդի անուն Խեշայ կոչէր:*» Similarly, king Pap is forced to return the lands of the Kamsarakans, although he presents this restitution as a gift, MX III, xxxviii, pp. 305—306 [= MK II, p. 92/3]; also xlii, xlii, pp. 311, 313 [= MK II, pp. 104/5, 108/9], etc. Significantly, where property is not restored, the reason given for the impossibility of restitution is the registration of the property in the Persian archives, MX III, xlviii, pp. 318—319 [= MK II, pp. 118/9—120/1], thus indicating a Persian as against an Armenian centralization. In Armenia, the confiscation of church property by Pap is viewed as an act of arbitrary injustice performed by an evil king, P'B V, xxxi, p. 345 [= CHAMA I,

p. 295]. The struggle of the Armenian crown to turn the ancestral lands of the *naḫarars* into royal *beneficia* is quite evident in most of these passages, and indeed throughout the sources, but the ultimate victory belongs to the magnates rather than to the crown.

76 As in the case of the return of confiscated lands, we find the return and automatic re-assumption of hereditary privileges without any need for royal sanction, indeed in defiance of a royal grant, in the case of Manuēl, the senior member of the Mamikonean house, P'B V, xxxvii, pp. 358—359 [= CHAMA I, p. 299]. *Եւ եղև իբրև եկն հաս յերկիրն Հայոց Մանուէլ եղբարրն իւրով կոմսիւ հանդերձ, իբրև ետես զնա Վաչէն որ յառաջն էր լեալ նահապետ, մինչ չեւ եկեալ էր ի նա եւ զնա զպատիւ իշխանութեանն զոր առեալ էր ի թագաւորէն Վարազդատայ: Քանզի նա էր երէց յազգին, և Մանուէլն ունէր զնահապետութեան ազգին տանուէրութեան պատիւն. և Վաչէ լինէր Երկրորդ:*

Իսկ յորժամ հաս եկաց Մանուէլն ի փառս տէրութեան իւրոյ, նախ առանց հրամանի թագաւորի Վարազդատայ ինքն յափշտակեաց զգորավարութեանն զօրավարպետութիւնն. զի այն ինչ որ իւրոյ նախնեացն ի բնէն կալեալ էր ի սկզբանէ, զոր արքայն Վարազդատ չնորհ առնէր իւրում զպիկին Բատայ, զայն Մանուէլ յինքն ունէր զիշխանութիւնն:

77 For example, in the case of Artavazd the minor son of the *sparapet* Vačē Mamikonean, who inherits his father's office and honours because they belong to his house in which there are no adults left, so that the actual functions of the office must be performed by Aršavir Kamsarakan and Andovk Siwni, P'B III, xi, pp. 43—44 [= CHAMA I, pp. 220—221]. It is interesting that Artavazd is invested "in front of the king" who is powerless to interfere in the transmission of the military leadership of the country to a child, despite the patent danger of such an action. Vide supra n. 44. As we have seen in the proceeding note, the attempted transmission of the *sparapetut'wn* to Bat Saharuni by king Varazdat ended in the ignominious failure of the crown. Vide infra n. 81.

78 Vide supra n. 46. There seems to be no doubt that the Armenian council grew increasingly more turbulent and arrogant as the Arsacid dynasty drew to its close, as had been the case in Parthia under the late Arsacids (Strabo, *Geography*, XI, ix, 3), and that it acted independently under the Marzbanate. On the other hand, the rôle of the Sasanian council was constantly restricted and reduced, as is evident in the shift from the active participation of the magnates and *mobadhs* in the choice of the new king in the *Letter of Tansar*, pp. 61—62 and 62, n. 1, to the mere registration of the late ruler's will in the *Testament of Ardašir*, p. 76.

⁷⁹ P'B IV, iii, p. 104 [= CHAMA I, p. 236].

⁸⁰ P'B III, viii, p. 31 [= CHAMA I, p. 217].

The magnates seem to have rapidly freed themselves from the obligation of attendance at court, since king Tiran was easily captured by the Persians because of the exiguity of his suite, P'B III, xx, pp. 80—81 [= CHAMA I, p. 231].

⁸¹ Vide supra, n. 47.

⁸² Toumanoff, *Studies*, pp. 34—40, 108—111 and n. 176, 112—119, where he comes to the conclusion that despite complications and ambivalences "...the feudal terminology proved weaker than the dynastic reality, and the 'appointment' meant nothing other than the confirmation or sanction and followed the accepted norms of genealogical succession. Likewise [in] cases of forfeiture... the forfeiture did not infringe upon the rights of the lawful heirs, to whom the confiscated domains eventually devolved". Vide supra n. 75. There seems to be no doubt that the turbulent Armenian magnates

and the independent Armenian clergy viewed the king at best as *primus inter pares*. As such they were far more reminiscent of the Parthian "*muluk al-Tawaif*" (cf. Bel'āmi, I, cxiv, p. 526; Šāhnāma, V, xxi, p. 216, etc.), than of the dignitaries of the organized and hierarchical Sasanian state.

⁸³ P'B V, xxxvii, p. 360 [= CHAMA I, p. 299], «Նա դու չես իսկ արչակունի, այլ ի պոռնկութենէ եղևալ ես որդի. վասն այդորիկ ոչ ծանեար զվաստակաւորսն արչակունեաց: Նա մէք չեմք իսկ լեալ ձեր ծառայք, այլ բնկերք ձեր եւ ի վերայ քան զձեզ. զի մեր նախնիքն լեալ էին թագաւորք աշխարհին ձեռնաց, ...Առաջին թագաւորքն արչակունիք, որք զիտէինն զմեզ ո՛վ էաք կամ ո՛ւտտի էաք. այլ զի դու քանզի չես արչակունի, դնա յաշխարհէս, եւ մի՛ մեռանիք ի ձեռնաց իմոց:

Իսկ վարազդատ թագաւոր պատգամ յղէր պատասխանոյն առ զօրավարն Մանուէլ, եւ ասէր. եւ քանզի չեմ արչակունի, զի եդի զթագ նախնեաց իմոց արչակունեացն, եւ կալայ զաշխարհ առաջնոց իմոց, եւ խնդրեցի զվրէժ հօրեղործն իմոյ Պատայ...»: